

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

10869

Pakistan, Turkey, and most of all, because of our stake in Vietnam. Most of us realize I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the United States through its aid program seeks to help build stable governments and to build up the economies of young countries.

Foreign aid today, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion is far more important than it was in the immediate postwar years. The fact that the job is more difficult is no reason for us to become tired of it, to throw up our hands, and to say we are no longer willing to support it.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, these are some of the basic reasons why I am sure this bill will receive strong support. After a careful review of all the pros and cons and after much detailed discussion, the Committee on Foreign Affairs approved this bill by a margin of 26 to 5. It deserves, and I am confident it will receive, comparable support in this body.

Mr. Chairman, mention was made earlier today of the need to reconsider the whole concept of foreign aid, of salvaging and strengthening those aspects which are good, and dropping those aspects which are bad. It is on this whole question of the advisability of a major recasting of foreign aid that I should like to speak briefly.

In certain circles recently, Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that the aid program as currently constituted should be continued for only 2 more years, pending the report of a special study group. This study group is to be called the Foreign Affairs Planning Group, which would consider the basic premises behind the foreign aid program. The proposed planning group would undertake a profound scrutiny of this program and, presumably, would suggest a completely new approach to foreign assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose such a course of action. In the first place on the basis of experience I doubt very much whether at this point we are likely to develop any constructive alternative to what we presently have. A 2-year limitation on foreign assistance in its current form, as has been proposed, would raise strong doubts among our friends and allies as to our basic commitment to continue foreign assistance. Discontinuance of foreign assistance seems a highly unlikely prospect, because our commitments in places such as Korea, Taiwan, and Vietnam are simply not going to disappear. There is a crucial situation in southeast Asia, and no matter what the developments there, no early solution seems likely. Also, many countries, in Latin America and elsewhere, have embarked upon important new reforms and programs in the expectation of continued American aid. That more governments are not stable is a basic reason to provide aid for such countries, and certainly no argument to cut it off.

It would, therefore, in my opinion, be particularly untimely at the present to attempt another major revision of the program. Moreover, a new study group would be disruptive to the proper functioning of the agencies which currently administer American assistance pro-

grams. Foreign aid, since it began in the postwar period, has had at least 11 major studies along with 2 yearly examinations by each House of the Congress. There are currently two studies underway. Substantial sums have already been expended in staff time in the legislative and executive branches in making these studies and in assisting investigators. The most recent report, the Clay report, was released in March 1963. Although some aspects of the Clay report are unclear in their recommendations, the report in general has resulted in many important changes in the foreign aid program. Proposals made in the Clay report, as well as recommendations from previous reports, are still being implemented. Only now are results beginning to show.

For example, and in accordance with the recommendations of the Clay report, almost three-quarters of the funds requested for development loans are scheduled to go to only seven countries. Almost 90 percent of the supporting assistance is expected to go to only four countries, all situated in critical areas of the world. Over 70 percent of the military assistance is going to 11 countries. Additionally, there are 26 countries which have received economic assistance in the postwar period when such assistance has been terminated, and where none is planned for the coming fiscal year. As a result of past reviews and particularly because of continuing congressional surveillance, the Agency for International Development is now far better administered than in the past. David Bell has held his critically important job for a longer time than any Administrator of the Agency, nearly 30 months. He has built up experience which is highly useful and important for future efficient administration of the Agency.

The major conclusion of all the past studies has been to show that there is no magic formula which can assure us that our foreign assistance will be efficiently used in furthering our foreign policy objectives. Rather, these reviews have merely emphasized again and again that the administration of foreign aid is a highly complex matter. Reshuffling the personnel responsible for these programs and reorganizing the administering agencies will not make the problem easier, but far more difficult. It is in part a reflection on Congress that this program, after all these years, is still subject to as much criticism as it is. In my opinion, we should not at this point attempt another major survey as to how we might improve the program.

I might say also that the current request for foreign aid is a reasonably tight one. The fact that we were able to cut the administration request by only \$12 million in committee is a clear indication of that. The \$2,004,195,000 in the new authorizations together with funds previously authorized provide the authority for a combined foreign assistance program of \$3,367,670,000 for the forthcoming fiscal year. Two-thirds of the total program will be used for economic assistance, primarily for capital and technical assistance for long-term economic

growth. This assistance is largely to be made available for long-term loans, repayable in dollars. One-third of the program is for military assistance and sales. It is particularly noteworthy that certain proposed changes in the program will sharply increase the participation of American private enterprise in stimulating economic development. The bill as recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee would double the specific risk guarantees to \$5 billion, and sharply increase the guarantees available to American firms participating in housing projects abroad. American firms would be particularly assisted in promoting housing projects in Latin America, where guarantees could be granted for \$200 million additional dollars permitting a total of \$450 million. No new money need be authorized for these programs.

Changes made in the administration of the aid program in recent years insure that nearly 90 percent of the assistance dollar is spent in the United States, for the purchase of American goods and services. Several hundred thousand American jobs have been created by the foreign assistance program. Industries producing agricultural and industrial machinery, iron and steel manufactures, chemicals, and motor vehicles have particularly benefited.

I would like to make one final point, if I may. In the discussion with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR]. I expressed concern about the so-called standby authorization on page 8 of the report to be placed in the contingency fund. This would provide authority for the President to use such sums in southeast Asia as may be necessary in the next fiscal year if he determines such use important to the national interest. I might point out there is no ceiling on the amount that the President might request of the Appropriations Committee under this authorization. There is no indication of an unexpected emergency that could not be met out of existing funds. I think, myself, it would be highly unwise for us to give this kind of a blank check authorization.

What we might do is to provide more funds in the contingency fund than are here requested. We authorized last year \$150 million in contingency funds to be used in southeast Asia, the Dominican Republic, or wherever the need might be. The current request is for only \$50 million. The point was made that the amount in the contingency fund was reduced because of the special, separate authorization for South Vietnam. The sums which we have made available for the increase in our own forces in southeast Asia are an indication that we are wary about any increase made without taking a good look as to what we might spend beyond what is projected in this bill.

We have had some reference in today's debate to the speech the President had made about regional development of the Mekong Delta. I do not know how much the United States should put into such a program if there could be some cessation of hostilities in that area. But I am quite sure such an authorization should be made only after the authorizing commit-

tee and the appropriations committee have reviewed the executive branch's proposals. We have demonstrated, as the gentleman from Indiana pointed out, the ability of the Congress to act if the need should arise.

In view of the fact that we have never given the Executive such authority in the past, and in view of the fact there is no current justification of the necessity for utilizing such a fund in the future, I think we should be wary of granting such a blank check.

I do trust that we recognize the foreign aid program as a whole as reported in the bill we have before us makes sense, and that the use of the funds have been carefully scrutinized. That should not prevent us from looking with some care at the individual changes in the law that we have suggested.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would urge again we vote in a very substantial way in favor of this bill. I think it is important to us, to our allies, and to our own security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am moved to remark that on the Committee on Foreign Affairs we are thrice blessed. We are blessed with a chairman who is terrific. He is the personification of courtesy and a paragon of patience. He is a giant in ability. We are indeed blessed in having the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, as our chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we are blessed too by having on the committee what everyday impresses us more as the finest expression of American womanhood, Mrs. BOLTON on the Republican side and Mrs. KELLY on the Democratic side.

Mr. Chairman, we are blessed yet again by having as our colleague the statesman from New Jersey, the able and scholarly gentleman who preceded me, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for whose ability and dedication we have admiration, and for whose warm personal traits affection.

Yes, it means so much to our committee that we work together as a team and in most matters on a nonpartisan basis. Most of us voted for this bill. Four or five or six members may have voted against it, but in a sort of quiet and non-disagreeable way, as those things perhaps that concerned them were more good than bad in the measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to our beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say, too, that we are all blessed in having not only as a member of this committee but as a Member of the House of Representatives the great gentleman from Illinois—the youngest thinking Member of the House of Representatives [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the distinguished Speaker, from the bottom of my heart and in acknowledgement of his too kind remarks may I say—yes, I

am getting along a little bit in years but the older I get, the happier I am that my country—our country—has never been afraid of the tomorrows. With faith and courage in meeting unafraid the problems that may be ahead we have made each tomorrow a glorified today.

When I was a boy, the population of the entire State of California was a bit more than 1 million people, about the population at that time of the city of Philadelphia. When I contemplate the growth of California in the span of my lifetime, and think of the impact of that tremendous growth on the economy of my State of Illinois and of every part of the United States, I can have no fear of the future or doubt of the wisdom of our foreign aid program. On a worldwide basis I look ahead to the countries and the continents of Africa and Asia and South America—I look in the future to the developing nations of the world, and know that when some of my younger colleagues have reached my present age some of these new countries of today will be to the world of the tomorrow what California is to the United States of today. Our economy will benefit with the economy of the new nations. There are no one-way streets in the modern world.

I could worry about automation if I did not think more of what I see approaching in Africa, Asia, Latin America—new nations rising—nations that will have great buying power and will supply great markets for our industries—all because of the investments of today from the hearts and the means of our country to foreign aid.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is a very happy day for me to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in acclaiming the legislation we have before us.

We are gaining. Make no mistake on that. We are gaining every day and in every way in reaching the objective of this program.

As the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] said so well and so eloquently, in the past 10 years the agricultural products of the free world have increased by 20 or 25 percent.

Mind you, one of the great enemies we face is poverty. Today the free world, and as a result of this program, is producing much more food to feed the hungry. That is progress in the right direction.

In the past 10 years the number of children going to school in the free world has increased 50 percent. Thus we are striking at another enemy of mankind: ignorance. All that because of the foreign aid program. And that is progress in the right direction.

The lifespan of people in Latin America, in Asia, in Africa, in all the underprivileged portions of the free world, has lengthened tremendously in the past 10 years. All because of the foreign aid program, certainly, in large measure; and that is progress in the right direction.

So I see ahead the glorious harvest of blessings from this program of foreign aid. It is destroying poverty. It is destroying ignorance. It is destroying disease.

After those three enemies of humanity have been destroyed, we shall have

reached the millenium, and all mankind will live together in peace and happiness, in plenty and in dignified worthwhileness.

Mr. Chairman, I add only the words inscribed in this Chamber and in all our minds and hearts: "In God We Trust."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I yield back my remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7750

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1965".

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LANDRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the military procurement authorization bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

WEST GERMAN CUBB SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have received assurances that West German ships will not call in North Vietnam again.

The latest list of free world ships calling in North Vietnam which I published on page 7510 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12 contains the names of 153 vessels and companies engaging in this trade. The list should be amended accordingly.

The West German ships concerned are as follows:

Ostensible owner:	Vessel
Stinnes Hugo Transocean	
Schiffahrt.....	Hugo Stinnes.
Reederei Rickmers	
(Bremen).....	Paul Rickmers.
Scipio & Co.....	Brake.

The owners of the *Brake* have sold that vessel to Nationalist China. The owners of the *Hugo Stinnes* and the *Paul Rickmers* have assured the West German Government that they will cooperate

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

10871

with U.S. policies against this trade. The owners of the *Hugo Stinnes* have advised that this ship has been under charter to ATIC, the French Government agency handling coal purchases from North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I have contacted the Department of State on the subject of free world trade with the Vietcong, and on March 31 received assurances that the State Department was "right now in the middle of a full-scale study of this problem" which was to "be completed shortly." Nearly 2 months of study have gone by, with no results made known. I urge the State Department to double its efforts for more allied cooperation on this trade.

There is a State Department blacklist of free world shipping to Communist Cuba. It has been effective in curtailing a great deal of this shipping simply because it publicly exposes foreign shippers who would rather trade with the Communists than Americans.

We certainly need similar exposure of allies shipping to North Vietnam when the Vietcong are firing on our own troops.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has designated this week—the week of May 23 through May 30—as National Small Business Week to point up the contributions made to our Nation by America's 4.7 million small businessmen.

This tribute to small businessmen is appropriate and well deserved.

Small business constitutes 95 percent of all American business.

Small business accounts for 40 percent of all business activity.

Small business provides employment for 40 percent of the labor force in our country.

Small business pays taxes.

It is the livelihood of 75 million Americans—owners, employees, and members of their families.

It accounts for more than 70 percent of sales volume in retailing, wholesale, construction, and services—and more than 30 percent of value added in manufacturing.

Small business is the core of our free enterprise system—the economic seed-bed of America.

It is appropriate that we recognize these contributions.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge the citizens of this great Nation to give a special pat on the back, this week, to the small businessman.

He deserves it, and more.

GIVING THANKS FOR THE SOIL

(Mr. HANSEN of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this being Soil Stewardship Week, I

think it appropriate that the House of Representatives pay tribute to its sponsors—the local soil and water conservation districts of America. There are 100 of them in Iowa. The men and women who serve without pay on the governing bodies of these local units of State government deserve our praise for the leadership they are providing for resource conservation and development in our home communities.

Although Soil Stewardship Week is sponsored by soil and water conservation districts, the materials for supporting it were developed in cooperation with an advisory committee of church leaders. The advisers for this year's observance consist of the Reverend E. W. Mueller, National Lutheran Council, Chicago; the Reverend John George Weber, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Des Moines; the Reverend Harold Huff, board of missions, Methodist Church, Philadelphia; the Reverend Henry A. McCanna, National Council of the Churches of Christ, New York City; and the Reverend Lewis Newman, Southern Baptist Convention, Atlanta.

In the April issue of the Methodist Story, Reverend Huff describes soil stewardship for land and people. His views are summarized in one sentence:

While giving thanks for the soil and the men who till it, we consider ways to conserve both soil and community.

Under unanimous consent, I include Reverend Huff's article in the RECORD at this point:

FOR LAND AND PEOPLE
(By Harold S. Huff)¹

Rural Life Sunday is traditionally the fifth Sunday following Easter and is followed by Soil Stewardship Week (May 23–30 this year). This week in the spring season is designated as a time to give special recognition in worship to God for the blessings of material and human resources—for land and people in agriculture, industry, and communities.

Both physical and human resources are alike sources of blessings and sources of problems and concerns. Our attitudes as Christian stewards will largely determine our use of each of these.

"The Challenge of Growth" is the theme of Soil Stewardship Week this year with the acorn and the oak tree symbolic of the potential and the accomplishment, both fraught with challenge. Because America as a nation has grown through response to challenge, her church people may well pause to ponder the stewardship challenges of further growth.

Consider this quotation from the soil stewardship booklet for 1965: "Growth unleashes great, new challenges to man—to his courage, his vision, his heart, and reason. It multiplies the need for man to be honest with himself, to oppose the tyranny of fear, and to fight prejudice which denies truth. Growth is a challenge demanding freedom of the mind and freedom to speak out forthrightly. * * *

"It asks for compassion and divine guidance, without which increases become excesses. And growth is a challenge to leadership to fasten not only ideas and effort but patience and good purpose."

The theme for Rural Life Sunday and Soil Stewardship Week centers in 10 topics which

¹ Mr. Huff is a director of town and country work of the national division of the board of missions.

are among the challenges to be faced today.

1. "Diversity": "The very diversity of our growth carries within it the seeds of both good and evil."

2. "Pressures on the Land": "Our God-given supplies of land and water are limited—and He expects us to care for them as responsible stewards. * * *

"Our Creator decreed there would be variety in land, with uplands and lowlands, wet lands and dry lands, some fertile and some barren. He has a purpose for each and it could now be our critical task, as we join vision with prudence, to look for the right uses and see His prime purpose for each and do what must be done to comply, at last, with His plans."

3. "The Duty of Involvement": "It is the duty of churchmen to be involved in cooperative and conservation efforts which function as focal points toward the attainment of justice. * * * Whatever programs develop, the facts of rural-urban interdependence and world interrelationships are such that the steward's duty and involvement today are at once greater and more complex than ever before."

4. "Adjustment in Values": "The churchman examines new trends and institutions, developments in art and science, and changing customs and philosophies, to discover what they contain of constructive and destructive elements in the light of God's laws."

5. "Planning and Development": "Choice is the fruit of judgment. The prospect of wise judgment is enhanced by deliberation and careful planning."

6. "The Spread of Understanding": "We need a spread of understanding about chain reactions and multiple breakthroughs in the universe around us. But who is responsible for this spread? Who speaks for wisdom in land use, for balance between population and resources; and for social justice?"

7. "Areas of Poverty": "It is a callous affront to conscience to surrender with the excuse that 'the poor are always with us.' The responsible churchman does not surrender."

8. "The Need for Balance": "Our world was not designed to be rural or urban, black or white, land or water, farmers or lawyers, but a bit of each created by God to help the others, so that we can mature with growth and strengthen the prospects of both peace and freedom in the future."

9. "Area Development": "The ultimate benefits of good stewardship flow far afield, but there is a price: True mutual concern and cooperation must replace old rivalries between town and country and between town and town."

10. "A Test of Faith in God": "From those granted free will, God asks free services. A man of faith will choose to serve."

Pastors and church lay leaders are urged to contact their soil conservation district supervisors or the county extension agent for copies of the soil stewardship booklet.

This is the 11th in an annual series prepared by the Soil Stewardship Advisory Committee and published by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. It also may be obtained by writing the offices of NACD at Post Office Box 855, League City, Tex.

Soil conservation supervisors are usually anxious to cooperate.

(NOTE.—The Soil Stewardship Advisory Committee is an interfaith committee serving the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, a nongovernmental organization of some 8,000 districts throughout the Nation. Advisory Committee members are the Reverend Harold S. Huff, Methodist and representing the National Council of Churches; the Reverend Henry McCanna, American Baptist and representing

the NCC; the Reverend E. W. Mueller, National Lutheran Council; the Reverend Lewis W. Newman, the Southern Baptist Convention; and the Reverend J. G. Weber, National Catholic Rural Life Conference.)

JANE ADDAMS, FOUNDER OF HULL HOUSE

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago on May 21, 1935, humanity suffered a tragic blow in the death of Jane Addams of Hull House.

It was my personal privilege to know Miss Addams well for many years and I do not wish to see the anniversary of her death pass unnoticed. Her many contributions to the life of the city of Chicago and to America are still a vivid memory to those of us who were fortunate enough to be personally acquainted with this wonderful woman.

Most people are familiar with the general outlines of the story of how Jane Addams came to found Hull House. As a very young woman of 29, from a good family and with a good education, she decided to separate herself from all her comfortable and familiar surroundings and to dedicate her life to the poor and the unfortunate.

In 1889, she moved into a small house on Halsted Street on Chicago's near West Side, a neighborhood of immigrants from all over the world—Italians, Greeks, Jews, Poles, Hungarians, and Irish. She came to this area with a vision of a better America and she stayed there 50 years to help make that vision into a reality.

I grew up in that neighborhood and came to know Jane Addams well. It has always been a source of pride to me that as I grew older, my relationship to Hull House also matured and strengthened. As a boy of 12, I took part in drama classes and the other activities that she provided for us.

My earliest job was as a shoeshine boy in the Hull House. Later on in life, in 1942, I served as chairman of the war ration board 40-20 which was located in the Hull House. Now I have the honor of representing that same area in Congress.

It has become a common cliché that Miss Jane Addams was loved by all who knew her. However, it is no less true no matter how many times it is said. She was a kind and understanding woman who recognized the needs and wants of the immigrants in a large and strange metropolitan area.

The factor that set her apart as a human being of rare wisdom was her ability to translate ideals into action. The most profound monument to her courage and clarity of judgment is an endless number of laws and programs enacted on the local, State, and Federal levels embodying her concepts of love and justice.

When Jane Addams first sounded the trumpet for the end of child labor, for the recognition of labor unions, for the right of women to vote, for the regula-

tion of working hours and conditions, for help for the unemployed, the aged, and the ill—she did so almost alone.

Today these social and economic battles have been largely won. In no small measure is this victory due to the untiring efforts of one lone woman with a vision of life and a faith in humanity, Jane Addams of Hull House.

PROJECT EQUALITY: DETROIT CATHOLIC ARCHDIOCESE FIGHTS JOB BIAS WITH BUYING POWER

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic archdiocese of Detroit has taken a great step forward in the struggle to eliminate racial injustice and job discrimination. On Thursday, May 13, the archbishop of Detroit, the Most Reverend John F. Dearden, sent a letter to all the pastors and administrators of religious orders and institutions in the diocese forbidding any discrimination in hiring and prohibiting purchases from any business that discriminates.

I particularly want to commend this action, because it shows it is becoming more clearly recognized, that in the final analysis, racial discrimination can only be eliminated through determined efforts at every level of our society.

Thanks to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it is now the law of the land that discriminatory employment in industries affecting interstate commerce is prohibited. It was a necessary and important beginning. This declaration, by Americans who individually and collectively refuse to support bigotry in any form, either directly in their own hiring practices or indirectly through their purchases, should hearten all of my distinguished colleagues who supported and voted for the 1964 civil rights bill.

May I predict that the fine example set by the Detroit archdiocese will soon stimulate other dioceses all over the country to initiate their own equality of opportunity projects such as Project Equality.

I also think it reasonable to expect other religious denominations to quickly adopt similar programs. The impact of such nationwide activity would clearly go a long way to effectuate fair hiring and promotional practices.

The tone of the archbishops' letter is fair, realistic, and uncompromising. He firmly emphasizes the responsibility of the church to insure that "we, ourselves, are not discriminating in our hiring practices." The letter makes clear the steps that may be used to insure that all church purchases will be made from nondiscriminatory suppliers. The letter initiates a policy that in effect calls upon a consumer to not only base his purchase on price, quality, and service, but also upon the sellers' proven record of non-discrimination.

The archdiocese plans to use the review procedures developed by the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to insure that all of its suppliers

practice equal job opportunity. I feel the decision to adopt these procedures reflects the effectiveness of this committee under the leadership of its chairman, Vice President HUMPHREY, and its Executive Vice Chairman, Mr. Hobart Taylor, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following newspaper items regarding Project Equality be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks: article from the Detroit News of Thursday, May 13, on the announcement of Project Equality; a copy of Archbishop Dearden's letter to all pastors and administrators of religious orders and institutions in the Detroit Archdiocese; and an editorial from the Detroit News of Friday, May 14, commending Project Equality, and an article from the Michigan Catholic of May 20.

Article from the Detroit News of Thursday, May 13, on the announcement of Project Equality:

HIT RACIAL BARRIERS IN FIRMS

(By Harold Schachern, Detroit News religion writer)

The archdiocese of Detroit today led the Nation in throwing the purchasing power of the Catholic Church behind the struggle of Negroes and others for racial justice and equal job opportunity.

In announcing Project Equality, the Most Reverend John F. Dearden, archbishop of Detroit, said discriminatory hiring practices are immoral and that the archdiocese no longer will tolerate them among the firms and individuals with which it does business.

A MAJOR BUYER

Efforts also are being made to cross denominational lines for an allfaiths cooperative effort against job discrimination, it was announced.

Next to the Federal Government, the Catholic Church generally is regarded as America's largest purchaser of goods and services through its dioceses and religious orders.

The project also is to be started in the archdiocese of St. Louis, a spokesman said, although no public announcement has as yet been made there.

OTHERS TO FOLLOW

Others of the 150 other dioceses and archdioceses are expected to follow suit, particularly the Michigan dioceses of Lansing, Saginaw, Grand Rapids, and Marquette.

The carefully worded plan is designed to protect and enhance nonwhite job opportunities at rank-and-file, supervisory, and executive levels.

Archdiocesan spokesmen said at a press conference announcing the program today that while it is fashioned after the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity (PCEEO), Project Equality will go beyond the scope and limitations of this and other Federal laws and agencies.

Simultaneously with the announcement to the public today, a strongly worded statement signed by the archbishop went out to every pastor, every religious superior, and the head of every Catholic institution in the eight-county archdiocese, informing them of the new policy to be followed scrupulously.

His letter also announced the establishment of a new post to administer the program, that of director of merit employment, to operate under the archbishop's committee on human relations.

He named as the temporary director, Thomas H. Gibbons, Jr., of Chicago, director of employment services for the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice "until a permanent director is appointed."

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

10889

Treasury continues to dispose of its reserves of silver redeeming silver certificates. This has acted as a price control on silver.

Mr. Speaker, the article in the American Metal Market was sent to me by Mr. Christian F. Verbeke of Derry, N.H., who identifies himself as the editor of two numismatic publications and the author of some 200 articles on related subjects. In his letter to me he advised that about 400 coin dealers who are connected by teletype service were offering the forthcoming silver dollars at between \$1,800 and \$2,500 a bag of 1,000 dollars. He also said that coin advertisements will be released this week which will feature the 1964 dollars, offering them for sale at \$4.45 and \$5 each. His letter follows:

CHRISTIAN F. VERBEKE,
Derry, N.H., May 20, 1965.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, House Monetary Affairs Subcommittee,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your stand on the undesirability of minting 1964-dated silver dollars is positively justified. As you may recall, in our earlier correspondence I have found that the findings of your Monetary Affairs Subcommittee on the silver and coinage question to be of uttermost significance and of definite validity.

May I stress at this time that the forthcoming issuance of 45 million silver dollars is not only nefarious as it tends to deplete our already critical silver reserves, but in addition it reopens the Pandora's box of senseless speculation in current coinage—a phenomena which had reasonably abated recently.

At the time of this writing coin dealers connected by teletype service (some 400 of them) are offering the forthcoming 1964-dated silver dollars at between \$1,800 and \$2,500 a bag, or an initial price of \$1.80 to \$2.50 for one specimen.

I cite specifically Mr. Freeman Bishop, staff writer of American Metal Market, who reports some coin dealers are giving the new coin a value of \$5—an inherent scandal. (Mr. Bishop's article is enclosed.)

It is indeed unquestionable that the silver dollar has lost its significance as a medium of circulation (hundreds of millions are hoarded); moreover, the contrivance risks to accomplish exactly the opposite of its intended goal, viz., instead of being bona fide metallic currency, it will become an instrument of renewed speculation, profiteering on the guillible if not the symbol of base mercantile in numismatics.

Although I am editor of two numismatic publications and the author of some 200 articles on related subjects, I am addressing myself to you as a private citizen anxious to see speculation in metallic currency eradicated and our national silver assets preserved for worthwhile purposes.

Warmest personal regards,

CHRISTIAN F. VERBEKE.

P.S.—At the last minute I have been reliably informed that coin advertisements to be released next week will feature the 1964 dollars for sale at \$4.45 and \$5.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress last year placed on the President the responsibility for having the silver dollar coined. I think that Congress must now give its earliest possible consideration to relieving the President of that responsibility.

OUR CONTINUING COMMITMENT TOWARD PEACE, ECONOMIC GROWTH, AND POLITICAL STABILITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Mr. DANIELS (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 22, 1965, my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] was the principal speaker at the 14th Air Force Association banquet which was held at the Grammercy Inn in Washington, D.C.

In the period immediately following Pearl Harbor many of the "Flying Tigers," American volunteers fighting for Chiang Kai-shek's China, became part of the 14th U.S. Air Force.

In his speech, Congressman SICKLES discussed our continuing commitment toward peace, economic growth, and political stability in southeast Asia. His remarks regarding the operation of our foreign aid program and its relationship to our military and political objectives are especially timely in view of our consideration of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965.

I think his remarks are worthy of the attention of all Members of the House. Congressman SICKLES is a veteran of the China-Burma-India theater during the Second World War and he has maintained his interest in this part of the world. It was during this period that he met his lovely wife, the former Simone Shornick, of Shanghai, China. When he speaks about our policies in Asia, he brings a great deal of expertise to his subject. I am proud to insert his speech at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY MR. SICKLES

Ladies and gentlemen, when I meet with a group like this, I feel I should be doing the listening rather than the speaking. I should be listening to the tales of men who set standards for a decade of American heroes.

For it was you who went where heat and history hung heavy in the air. It was you who went where the work was waiting. It was you who went where death was lurking.

While most men preferred a rocker on the front porch, the Flying Tigers took to the air in tandem for a cause. While most men had never even heard of the Indo-Chinese Peninsula, the Flying Tigers were getting a bird's-eye knowledge of hot weather in the hundreds and hot pilots in the Zeros.

Little by little, the camaraderie, the crushed cap, and the courage became idols to a generation of American kids if not to their more astigmatic parents. Sooner or later even the adults got the message.

Well, gentlemen, things haven't changed much out there. We are still involved in the championship game for the coveted Rice Bowl. And the stakes remain the same. Loss means dictatorship and death.

And not unlike the days of 1939, there are a few who say we are playing in the wrong league; that we have no right to be there. That we can't win. That the competition is too tough.

But when you are the strongest you must accept the defense of the weak. Politics like

nature abhors a vacuum. And for a quarter of a century, the Indochinese Peninsula has been a vacuum of power.

Today the United States is back in the Rice Bowl to help fill that vacuum—to again turn back aggression.

Nevertheless the game has changed. Japanese aggression was of an obvious order. The Communists seek to blur the struggle by telling the hungry that all shall be fed; by telling the sick that all shall be healed; by telling the old that all shall be cared for.

For this reason we have a second team out in southeast Asia; a team whose goal is to prove that freedom can deliver what communism can only promise—that free choice not only feels better but works better than coercion. This team attacks the heart of insurgency: poverty, sickness, and ignorance. In Vietnam this battle is fought not by soldiers but by more than 800 doctors, educators, farm experts, health workers, and engineers. It is fought not with guns but with books, ideas, and hardwork.

Like the Flying Tigers, these men are unheralded often unheard of. One of them, Joe Grainger, 39, got a few lines of credit in the newspaper. He was shot dead when he resisted recapture by the Vietcong. He had escaped after being chained in a cave for 5 months.

Our people from the Agency for International Development are in Vietnam of their own volition; and they are staying on their own volition. They walk down lonely dirt roads, unarmed, knowing there is perhaps one thing between them and death. The Vietcong fear the wrath of the villagers who have grown proud of their American helpers.

These AID people believe in their work. Do we? Do we have as much faith in the drawing power of people, ideas and progress as we do in the firepower of mortars and missiles.

Few Americans can realize what it means to a village to receive help in digging a well or making a more efficient windmill. Few Americans know what it means to have the output of an acre of rice doubled. Few Americans can know what a difference in health that fish from a newly stocked pond can make.

In 1964, over 50,000 tons of fertilizer were eagerly received in the central lowlands where none would have otherwise been used. The average rice yield was increased by 40 percent.

Through AID programs, malaria has virtually been wiped out from the central provinces. Thousands of health clinics have been built and stocked with medicine. American doctors sacrifice both salary and safety for this insecure world.

But we are trying to build a decent world in Vietnam amid the whirl of bullets and the crash of mortar shells. This is building at its most frustrating; and there are lessons to be learned.

Communist insurgency can be stopped in peace easier than in war. For the time being there is at least uneasy peace in the remainder of southeast Asia. But the time is running out. The Communists have a timetable for their wars of "national liberation."

For instance they have earmarked northeast Thailand as one of the next targets—and they have been quite open about it. The six provinces of the northeast section lie along Laos and the Mekong River. If Laos falls into Communist hands, this border could be a sieve for infiltration. Indeed, it already is.

A major share of U.S. assistance requested for next year is aimed toward this internal security threat. This area is isolated from

the rest of Thailand. The accelerated rural development program will move in, trying to expand communication lines and roads as well as build schools, irrigate lands, and establish health programs.

The first all-weather highway linking the capitals of Thailand and Laos was officially opened in January. The 246-mile road runs through the heart of the northeast from Bangkok on the Gulf of Siam to Vietiane in Laos.

It has created many advantages. For instance, Pakchong was just a jungle village a few years ago. Today it is a booming agricultural center, the result of this "Friendship Highway."

It has grown from 5,000 in population to 65,000. Forests are being cleared and crops being diversified. Farm cooperatives and mechanization have transformed farming in the area into a profitable export business. It once was on a bare subsistence level.

AID will support Thai efforts to improve the position of the northeast farmers with a strong extension service and research in agricultural techniques. The Thais intend to increase the number of agricultural extension officers from 1 for every 13,000 farms in 1963 to 1 for every 2,000 farms by 1967. A new service will handle farming classes for hundreds of students.

AID will contribute agricultural advisers, and advanced training in the United States to key Thai technicians. We will provide seed, fertilizer, and pesticides.

Studies now underway are aimed at finding means to establish light industries in the northeast and to use the areas of two major river basins for irrigation and flood control projects.

Meanwhile the terror has already started. The Vietcong tactic of assassinating village leaders is now being stepped up in northeast Thailand. Part of our aid will go toward training and equipping Thailand's 6,300-man mobile border patrol police and for strengthening the counterinsurgency capability of the provincial police.

AID will support training programs for nearly 3,000 local officials and village teachers and help supply 500,000 elementary school students in northeast's 6 border provinces with improved textbooks.

DDT and spray equipment will be supplied to help the Thais accelerate the malaria control program to cover the northeast assistance for equipment and technical help will continue to a project initiated in 1957 to train doctors and nurses for work in the rural areas. The medical school graduated its first class of 57 doctors in May of last year.

To men of action this all may not only sound like slow drudgery but it also may smack of futility. Well, wars can hinge on the outcome of a battle; but the war for minds is a tenuous thing.

Democratic ideas and institutions do not sprout over night. Freedom needs no small amount of care to blossom. If we cannot, if we will not give that care, we may sacrifice our own share.

Thailand may be a gamble. But we think it is a good one. Over the past 10 years, Thailand has made steady progress in modernizing its government and civil service. The Thai put nearly one-fifth of their entire budget into education and 70 percent of their population is literate today.

Last year the Thai Government contributed more to the cost of AID development projects than we did. AID's contribution for American experts and commodities totaled \$6.9 million, and the Thai contributed the equivalent of \$7 million for local costs: labor, material—the sweat to make the dollars work. This is self-help at its best—the commodity we can't supply and the commodity we need.

Now if you still think it can't work, circle June 30 on your calendars. On June 30, some old friends of yours and mine on

Taiwan will step out on their own. On that date, U.S. economic aid will end and the Republic of China will move ahead alone, strong, and independent.

How did it happen. Fifteen years ago it looked like free China would be on our welfare roles forever. In fact, Taiwan at the time was more dependent on U.S. aid than Vietnam is today. But the dole is done. Free China isn't rich but it's ready. With our help, and a herculean effort on their own part, they now have better roads, ports, power stations. A land reform program has raised agricultural yields to equal those of Japan.

The United States has contributed the technical advisers, the capital and surplus foods. The Chinese worked hard, saved hard, taxed themselves hard. There has been little luxury consumption.

And here is the crucial change: Now on Taiwan there is enough competence, enough trained leadership, enough capital so the Chinese can go ahead on their own. They have learned to use science and technology to overcome their problems.

By U.S. standards, the Chinese are far from rich. Their per capita income is only about \$150 per year compared to some \$2,500 per year here.

But they can carry the ball. The spiral is upward instead of being trapped in poverty. Her export earnings have risen from less than \$100 million to more than \$400 million in the past 10 years—25 other countries have traveled the same "comeback trail."

Since 1960, grants used primarily to keep countries afloat in emergencies, have been ended in 18 countries.

And Israel and Greece are close to taking the same step as Taiwan: ending all economic aid. Major progress has been made in India, Pakistan, and Turkey to mention only a few.

The success of Free China is not only an inspiration to the United States but to these other developing countries. Our old friends out there have done well.

The eyes of all of southeast Asia are upon them. The success of the Republic of China has renewed the determination of the entire area. And President Johnson is determined to help these countries succeed.

On April 7, the President advocated a sweeping program that could create one of the most dramatic changes in the economic life of the area in its entire history.

"The vast Mekong River," the President pointed out, "can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA."

Development of the Mekong to harness power, irrigate thirsty lands, control the flooding during the rainy season, and even provide a means of navigation was part of a new billion-dollar proposal by the President.

He commented that, "We often say how impressive power is. But," he said, "I do not find it impressive at all. The guns and bombs are all symbols of human failure. A dam built across a great river is impressive. A rich harvest in a hungry land is impressive. These, not mighty arms, are the achievements which the American Nation believes to be impressive."

Heat and history still hang heavy in southeast Asia. You can't paint tiger's teeth on a stethoscope or a tree sprayer, but at least the same feeling is also there. We intend to win. And it helps to think back to another time when another group of tough men fought a lonely battle—and won.

BANK MERGER BILL

(Mr. MOORHEAD (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Bank Merger Act to provide that the approval of a merger by a Federal banking supervisory agency shall exempt a transaction from the antitrust laws unless it is promptly contested in court by the Attorney General.

In cases found by the approving agency to be emergencies requiring expeditious action, the exemption from the antitrust laws would be automatic and immediate.

Most cases, however, would be governed by the 7-day waiting period provided in paragraph (2) (B), as proposed to be added by the bill. Banking agency approval would become final and would exempt the transaction from the antitrust laws unless within 7 days the Attorney General announced his intention to bring suit.

In effect, paragraph (2) (B) would enact into law the present procedure followed by the Federal Reserve Board. That agency generally makes the effective date of its approvals under the Bank Merger Act 1 week after announcement, thus giving the Attorney General an opportunity to file suit if he is so disposed.

Under the bill, an announcement by the Attorney General of his intention to file suit, rather than the actual commencement of litigation within the first 7 days after announcement of approval would be sufficient to hold the matter open, but only if the Attorney General followed through by actually filing suit within the first 30 days after announcement of approval.

Finally, if the Attorney General were unsuccessful in the litigation, then the merger would be unconditionally exempt.

Section 2 of the bill would unconditionally exempt all mergers consummated before the date of enactment.

Text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8388

A bill to amend the Bank Merger Act to provide that the approval of a bank merger by the appropriate supervisory agency shall be conclusive unless promptly contested in court by the Attorney General, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(c)) is amended (1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(c)", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) The approval pursuant to paragraph (1) by the appropriate Federal banking supervisory agency of any merger shall become conclusive, and the transaction shall become exempt from the antitrust laws, upon the happening of any of the following events:

"(A) A determination, published by the approving agency with its approval of a merger, that the situation is an emergency requiring expeditious action.

"(B) The expiration of a period of seven days beginning on the first day following the day of the publication of approval, during which the Attorney General has neither brought nor published his intention to bring an action to prohibit the consummation of the merger.

"(C) The expiration of a period of thirty days, beginning on the first day after the publication of approval, during which the Attorney General has failed to bring an action to prevent the consummation of the merger.

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2563

historians, are essential to an explanation of what is being justly celebrated as the longest economic expansion in recent history.

The evidence indicates that the current upswing, while unbroken, has not proceeded smoothly along its upward course. A sharp rebound soon regained the ground lost during the 1960-61 recession. But early in 1962 the vigor of the expansion began to ebb. And by the late spring a chorus of Cassandras was busily prognosticating the onset of the fifth, postwar recession.

The fatigue that almost ended with the death of the expansion in the autumn of 1962 provides a classic example of the manner in which economic and psychological forces interact. On the economic side, a number of factors were responsible for the persistence of excess capacity and a low level of profits. There was the fiscal drag of the high, wartime tax rates. There was the restrictive policy of the Federal Reserve authorities that halted the growth of the money supply by mid-1962. But the most menacing blow came from the political and psychological side. The President Kennedy did not gain the full confidence of the business community in 1960, and his reservoir of good will was sorely depleted by the ugly dispute over steel prices and the sharp break in the stock market, both of which occurred in the fateful spring of 1962.

What turned the tide and saved the expansion from an untimely death was the Kennedy administration's shift toward a genuinely expansive economic policy. The investment credit provisions of the 1962 Revenue Act and reform of the depreciation guidelines were moves that helped to check the further erosion of business confidence. But the crucial turning point in business expectations coincided with the administration's active commitment to reduce income taxes. When the drive to cut taxes began to take shape early in 1963, the volume of new orders placed with durable goods industries rose sharply, presaging the expansion of capital outlays that followed.

The revival of confidence would not, of course, have been sufficient to propel the economy along the path of rapid growth. There were other favorable factors. Nearly 57 percent of the automobiles in 1962 were over 5 years old, a factor which set the stage for the subsequent boom in new car sales. Price stability played a significant role in the striking expansion of U.S. exports. Since 1961 private exports have risen from \$20 billion to an annual level of nearly \$28 billion. Finally, the stability of wages, by permitting unit labor costs to decline, contributed greatly to the growth of profits, profits which in turn stimulated investment.

The first editorial ended with the question of whether the upswing has been sustained by accident or design. The answer is that it was design—the pursuit of appropriate economic policies culminating in the tax cut of 1964—that tipped the scales. Our final editorial in this series will discuss the measures that must be taken to strengthen economic policy in the future.

THE LONG UPSWING—III

There was a time when Americans, like the figures in a Greek tragedy, looked upon the recurrence of economic recessions as a phenomenon over which mere mortals have no control. But the times have changed. The President's Council of Economic Advisers, in its report on the long upswing, states that: "It is premature to say that business cycles have been eliminated. But we now know that there is no necessary reason why an expansion must end in 26

months, 36 months, 80 months or any other arbitrary length of time."

The Council members share the economist's reluctance to write what might be a premature epitaph for the business cycle. They are painfully aware of the fact that consumers will not continue to buy 8 or 9 million cars each year, that housing markets can be saturated, that narrowing profit margins can sour businessmen's expectations and cause the volume of investment in new capital equipment to decline. These developments are inherent in an enterprise economy, but they need not produce recurrent slumps in aggregative business activity. Wise Government policies, by mitigating and reversing the forces of recession can so limit economic fluctuations that they are manifested only as changes, speedups and slowdowns, in the rate of economic growth.

The experience of the past 51 months proves beyond any doubt that there are effective fiscal and monetary tools available for mitigating cyclical fluctuations. But although the tax cut of 1964 has proved a stunning success, the arsenal of policy weapons is far from adequate.

It should not in the future require 18 months of debate to convince the Congress and the American people that the economy can be stimulated by tax reduction. But a considerable period of time would still have to elapse between the appearance of the first danger signal and the time when Congress could be expected to act to reduce taxes. It is this delay that weakens the defense against recessions. Until the Congress grants the President limited authority to reduce payroll taxes—or at the very least establishes special, emergency procedures for dealing with White House requests for tax reduction—the economy will continue to be vulnerable to business cycles.

Endorsement of Vietnam Policy by Chicago Circle Young Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution adopted by the Chicago Circle Young Republicans dated April 22, 1965, with respect to our policy in Vietnam and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CHICAGO CIRCLE
YOUNG REPUBLICANS, APRIL 22, 1965

Whereas U.S. military personnel are in South Vietnam at the request of the South Vietnamese Government.

Whereas these forces are assisting the Vietnamese Government in fighting armed Communist aggression.

Whereas the U.S. current policy in Vietnam is one of peace through firmness and not one of defeat: Therefore be it

Resolved, We, the Chicago Circle Young Republicans endorse the U.S. current policy in Vietnam; be it further

Resolved, We do not approve of those groups which advocate a cessation of the current Vietnamese policy.

Short Talk Before the Boy Scouts Blackhawk Council in Rockford, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was our great good fortune to have as our speaker at the annual dinner meeting of the Blackhawk Area Council, Boy Scouts of America in Rockford, Ill., on May 16, 1965, Gen. James H. Doolittle. His long and distinguished career in aviation has made him a truly, legendary hero. It would be difficult indeed to select from his career any particular event, so many and varied have been his exploits. In World War II his leadership in both the Pacific and in North Africa was a decisive element in our ultimate victory over the Axis Powers. However, even more significant than his wartime exploits is the fact that he has served as a hero for the boys of America—a man to whom they could look for inspiration because of his valor, patriotism, and great contributions to the field of aviation.

America will forever be indebted to General Doolittle. Moreover, because of his interest in the youth of America, and particularly his recognition of Scouting as one of our most useful tools in molding a generation of patriotic and self-reliant young Americans, he has made contributions during peacetime that equal if not exceed his great contributions during time of war.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this point to include the very excellent remarks delivered by Gen. James Doolittle at the Boy Scout Blackhawk Area Council meeting. I am sure that everyone who reads them will be impressed with the succinct and eloquent fashion in which General Doolittle has restated some of our essential American beliefs:

SHORT TALK BEFORE THE BOY SCOUT
BLACKHAWK COUNCIL MEETING IN ROCKFORD,
ILL.

(By J. H. Doolittle)

I believe in the Boy Scouts and I believe in America.

We Americans are very fortunate.

We live in the greatest country in the world.

It has been said that our country is great largely because of its abundant natural resources.

This is true, but it must be remembered that our most important natural resource is our people; and the principal reason for our greatness is the high morality, clear foresight, and abundant energy—willingness to work—of our Founding Fathers and their successors.

We—particularly the young people who will soon be directing the destiny of our Nation—have a solemn obligation to protect and perpetuate integrity, opportunity, and freedom in America.

History teaches us that every great civilization, which has flourished and fallen, has

A2564

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 24, 1965

failed largely because of an erosion of moral values and a gradual unwillingness to exert the considerable effort necessary to continue to progress and to compete.

In the simplest terms: Decline resulted from immorality and laziness.

People who have it too good—that is to say, too easy—for too long incline to get soft and lazy. The motive necessary for great effort and great accomplishments no longer exists.

They are no longer willing to work—physically and mentally—and to sacrifice in order to maintain their position and prestige. Eventually they are unable to compete and, when it finally becomes necessary, unable to fight effectively for their survival.

Then some more ambitious and aggressive nation comes along and takes them over. We must be sure that this does not happen to us.

We have had a very high standard of living for along time.

This is good, but we must see that it does not make us soft.

There is a very strong tendency for this to happen; particularly when we forego discipline and responsibility and consistently live beyond our means.

A very wise friend of mine expresses it succinctly by saying: "Beware the ravages of prosperity."

Any attempt to maintain the status quo without progress through effort—any desire to get something for nothing—unfavorably affects our sense of values and—over the long haul—is doomed to failure and disappointment.

Technology, which gives us many good things and should make our lives easier, is posing many difficult problems for which we do not yet have answers.

More leisure is certainly desirable, but it is useful only if we plan the suitable employment of that leisure time.

Time is a valuable commodity. We must not waste it.

Certainly we must help our less fortunate brothers. Jesus said: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It is our duty to serve our fellow man. But the most valuable help we can give a person—or another nation—is to assist them in achieving the ability—and in some cases the desire—to help themselves.

Education and training are prime ingredients of this help; and we must furnish encouragement and incentives to stimulate effort.

We must help in such a way as to assure that shiftlessness is not encouraged and that the dole does not become a way of life.

Abraham Lincoln said: "You cannot establish sound security by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

If I may indulge in a gross oversimplification of the problem: It seems to me that a fundamental problem in America today is a change in order—an inversion—by many people, of our basic national values.

Our forefathers inclined to think of God, country, occupation, family and friends, and finally self; in that order.

They were religious and put worship of God before everything else.

They were patriotic and were willing to work, sacrifice and, if necessary, die for their ideals and for their country.

They worked hard and had pride of workmanship and pride of accomplishment.

They loved their family and a friend was a cherished possession. But family and friends came after God, country and work.

And last of all they thought of themselves and their personal needs.

Today many people think first of themselves.

Warranted self-confidence and justifiable personal pride, tempered by humility, are virtues. Conceit and selfishness are vices.

Nationally, instead of providing incentives for effort and excellence, it sometimes seems that we act in such a way as to encourage selfishness and laziness.

We are so anxious to protect the rights of the individual that we frequently, in trying to do so, interfere with the smooth functioning of the body politic. We violate the rights of others.

I believe that everyone, regardless of race, color or creed, has the right to think, say and do exactly as he chooses, up to the point where he begins to interfere with the rights of others.

Forgetting the obligation which is a concomitant part of personal freedom is one of the problems which is plaguing us today.

After having taken care of their personal problems some people next incline to think of family and friends. What can they get for them?

Work, to many, has become largely a means to an end. It permits them to eat.

It is rarely that the worker today works for the sheer pleasure of doing. That is, unless he is doing some one, not some thing.

Patriotism. Perhaps the simplest dictionary definition of patriotism is love of country. To me patriotism represents a code to live by. The late, great General MacArthur, in his final address to the Corps at West Point, described it in three words: "honor, duty, country."

To my distress patriotism is often belittled as an old-fashioned, unenlightened and unworthy emotion.

Well, when I can hear "The Star-Spangled Banner" and see our flag pass by and not feel an emotion in my heart and mind, and a lump in my throat—that I have indeed lived long enough.

And far too many people give only lip service—or no service at all—to God, to love, to the Golden Rule and to an ethical standard of conduct.

I am convinced that much of the trouble here in America—and throughout the world—is because of the reversal of those five fundamental values.

I speak, of course, in generalities and on the average. Certainly we have many God-fearing, patriotic, hard-working people in America today—and certainly some of our ancestors were stinkers.

But equally certainly we are not improving as a people and as a nation as rapidly as we might—and should.

How well we would do if all of our people were to live in accordance with the Boy Scout law and the Boy Scout oath.

We would all be trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

We would do our duty to God and country, we would help others at all times and would keep ourselves physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

Let's all live as we recommend that the Boy Scouts live. We will have—and continue to have—an even better, fairer, finer, stronger America.

What a wonderful example we will set for the rest of the world.

And someday perhaps, when people, everywhere, improve, our morality, honesty, compassion, justice, responsibility, intelligence, energy, courage, and strength may be instrumental in achieving what all people of good will hope for: An understanding, friendly, and peaceful world.

Farm Labor To Be Political Issue, Assemblyman Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the San Diego Union on May 15, 1965. This article fully supports the statements I made 2 weeks ago on the floor of this House.

(By Arthur Ribbel)

SACRAMENTO.—The lack of farm labor in California, emphasized by crops rotting on the ground, will be a political issue next year, according to a veteran legislator, Assemblyman Alan Pattee, Republican, of Salinas.

Pattee, a rancher, represents a district where crops, notably strawberries, have rotted on the ground for the lack of workers to harvest them.

Pattee and Senator Fred Farr, Democrat, of Carmel, in the same district, recently distributed boxes of strawberries from Salinas to legislators and newsmen at the capitol, with attached cards saying "SOS—Save Our Strawberries."

The worker shortage occurred after Congress failed to extend the Mexican farm labor (bracero) program which ended December 31. Since then, the State and Federal Government employment experts have been trying to enlist enough domestic workers to fill the gap. Growers said they have failed.

CHALLENGE ISSUED

Pattee put the trouble into the political arena when he said, "I hope that rotting food in the fields will be thoroughly photographed and documented so that in future elections the failure of Washington and Sacramento administrations can be made perfectly plain."

Not long afterward, Representative JAMES B. Utt, Republican, of Santa Ana, demanded the impeachment of Governor Brown for the farm labor situation.

Pattee criticized the administration of U.S. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, who has said he would not recommend any foreign workers be imported into California until domestic workers were placed in the fields.

CALLED "WHIMS"

"Never in the history of this democracy have we seen the entire economy of a State * * * from fields to the grocery shelves * * * dependent on the unknowledgeable whims of one man 2,500 miles away," said Pattee, referring to Wirtz.

"The entire situation has been a mess from the beginning," Pattee said.

"First the Governor failed to go directly to the President to seek assistance in getting in motion the negotiations with Mexico for supplemental help," Pattee said.

"Then the Secretary of Labor came out here with a closed mind and tried to learn in 4 days about one of the most complex problems to confront any State. Later, instead of selecting a panel of knowledgeable growers, labor people and industrial leaders, he selected three academic professors to pass judgment."

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2571

Though Washington has grown a great deal more determined of late, we suspect there's still doubt in some places abroad that it has found the full and final solution, especially in demanding voluntary restraint on American investing and lending overseas. When a company brings back capital it has in, say, France or Germany, it cannot bring it back again and again.

America's dollars, in short, are no longer considered abroad to be such fine things to have and to hold. Nor is the U.S. situation exactly unique. Britain's pounds hardly have the same international popularity they enjoyed before London began having its own balance-of-payments troubles, and the currencies of many other nations have experienced much sharper drops in world esteem.

In the circumstances, it's perhaps understandable that a lot of people in London, Washington, and elsewhere talk of getting together to create a new form of international currency that everyone will have faith in. The fallacy of that approach is that a new world currency in reality could not be sounder than the individual currencies on which it would be based.

A much more promising approach, it seems to us, would be to start building up the strength of the individual currencies. While Washington can't do much about the moneys of other nations, it could do a lot for the dollar if it would give up the notion of always inflating the economy to ever-expanding prosperity with artificially easy money, high spending, and big budget deficits.

Perhaps the world's monetary machinery could use some overhauling; in our changing world our institutions often have to be brought up to date. But in the end the overhaul will be self-defeating if the mechanics persist in believing that by fixing up the international machinery they can forever avoid those long overdue fiscal and monetary repairs right at home.

Swift Action in the Caribbean**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the Stockton, Calif., Record on May 7 printed a fine editorial appraising President Johnson's swift action in the Dominican Republic.

While many may debate the wisdom of these actions, I am certain the vast majority of Americans support the President. His decisive action did at least two things for which we owe a debt of gratitude—lives were saved, and communism was thwarted from establishing another Red tyranny in the Western Hemisphere.

The RECORD editorial follows:

UNITED STATES DOES THE JOB AS CRITICS ARGUE

With the Dominican crisis sputtering to an end, at least in its shooting phase, second-guessers are arguing over the wisdom of President Johnson's rapid dispatching of American troops to their first landing on the soil of a Latin nation in more than a generation.

One question that puzzles some critics is whether or not there ever really was any danger of a Communist takeover of the Dominican Republic. The New York Times,

for one, observed that since American troops had intervened, "no one any longer will be able to prove or disprove the thesis that a rebel victory would have brought a Communist government to Santo Domingo."

Presumably, the President should have waited until the new government had signed a trade agreement with the Soviet Union and Russian technicians had begun arriving, perhaps being spared from their duties in Cuba.

Others decry the great damage done the good neighbor policy and the concept of inter-American cooperation and equality and nonintervention in internal affairs, so laboriously built up over the years, by this alleged return to "gunboat diplomacy."

The fact is, however, that the Dominican revolution would have long been over before the Organization of American States could have decided on the need for action, and taken such action, had the United States sat back and waited upon its advice and consent.

The whole Dominican question, of course, should be debated in the councils of the OAS. But it is thanks to the United States that the problem confronting us and our Latin fellow members today is that of building stable democracy in the Dominican Republic and not what to do about another Communist foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

Smut Fighters**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the author of legislation aimed at combating the obscenity racket in the United States, I would like to commend the General Federation of Women's Clubs upon one of their current projects. The 9 million members of the general federation, which I am proud to say is presided over by a fellow Nebraskan, Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, have taken up the fight to stop the traffic in pornography among children. This is a most worthwhile endeavor on the part of these energetic and civic-minded women.

I think the Members of this distinguished body will be interested in an article which appeared in the Operation Yorkville newsletter, outlining the campaign that is being waged by the women of this country against the smut peddlers.

[From the Operation Yorkville, April-May 1965]

WOMEN OF THE YEAR—GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

(By Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, president)

Members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs—9 million strong across the Nation—have taken up the fight to stop the traffic in pornography among children. Spearheaded by the dynamic and dedicated Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, the drive was begun in November of 1964, when Mrs. Hasebroock said in that month's issue of the federation's national magazine, the Clubwoman: "Join your general federation in this crusade to rid our newsstands of morally destructive magazines."

Mrs. Hasebroock called upon federation clubs across the Nation to " * * * join us in this national campaign. I ask you to work in your communities to eliminate these

detrimental magazines from our newsstands." She said: "In recent months I have received a large amount of mail from clubwomen in all sections of the country protesting the emphasis on salaciousness which has gained such newsstand prominence. Consider this: surveys reveal that young people comprise a major part of the readership of these magazines. The results are matters of court records * * * sex crimes, shocking rises in social disease in teenagers, the total result is a lowering of our moral standards, the lives of young people blighted in their teens. It is due time that we clubwomen rise up and attack this problem, beginning with our individual communities * * *. Flagrant disregard of public opinion and public welfare cannot continue indefinitely. There is, inevitably, a day of reckoning. I hope this day now have arrived."

Once this opening salvo had been sounded, subsequent issues of the Clubwoman carried plans for community action: "Familiarize yourself with the obscenity laws in your town and State; appoint letter writing committees; stay clear of censorship; pass a resolution; enlist the support of other community groups and clubs."

Response to the call and to the guidepost for community action was immediate and overwhelming. Typical was a resolution passed by a Missouri group: "Be it resolved that the Quester's Club of Grandview, Mo., representing concerned mothers, joins with the other mothers and housewives of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in a nationwide crusade to remove from our newsstands, offensive and character-undermining sex magazines."

Pornography pushers have been put on notice. Nine million mothers represent a formidable fighting force. It was the general federation clubwomen who played a major role in the passage of the child labor laws; who followed through on the establishment of the children's bureau and legislation for child welfare and maternal care. And they were the motivating force that created the Food and Drug Administration.

Deserving of special mention in the Federation campaign is Mrs. Mary McGinn Taylor, editor of the Clubwoman for her excellent coverage of the problem and presentation of campaign plans.

A fine example of what these women's clubs are doing is contained in resolutions recently passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Whereas publishers and distributors of obscene material have taken advantage of the present definition "obscenity" as found in section 311 of the California Penal Code to vastly increase the publication in California and the distribution from within the State of such material: Therefore

Resolved, That the California Federation of Women's Clubs in convention assembled May 12, 1965, Los Angeles, Calif., urge its membership to redouble their efforts to impress upon all State legislators the necessity of making such changes in the above definition as will facilitate convictions in this field.

RESOLUTION BY THE MAR VISTA WOMAN'S CLUB, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The Mar Vista Woman's Club of the Marina District No. 13, CFWC of the GFWC passed the following resolution on April 12, 1965.

Whereas California's law on obscenity is extremely weak, having been severely damaged by the 1961 amendment to the code; and

Whereas California is now flooded with obscene publications; which have become widely available to our youth; and

A2572

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 24, 1965

Whereas the U.S. Senate Investigating Committee on Juvenile Delinquency has found that 75 to 90 percent of all filthy literature eventually reaches the hands of teenagers and younger children; and

Whereas many of the pornographic publications available in California are little more than handbooks in violence, crime, and perversion, dealing with all manner of immorality; and

Whereas these pornographic publications seek to degrade and destroy respect for the professions and institutions which we would encourage our children to honor; and

Whereas the sanctity of marriage and the home is ridiculed; and

Whereas there is an urgent need for an amendment to the California Penal Code to strengthen the State's antiobscenity law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Mar Vista Woman's Club of Marina District No. 18 of the California Federation of Women's Clubs of the General Federation of Women's Clubs calls upon the government of the State of California to take official cognizance of this critical situation. We call upon the administration to provide leadership in taking action to protect our youth from the flood of printed filth now available on our newsstands, and urge the California Legislature to adopt corrective legislation, and that copies of this resolution be sent to Gov. Edmund G. Brown and State Assemblyman Jesse M. Unruh, State Capitol Building, Sacramento, Calif., and to other women's clubs of Marina District.

Signed this 12th day of April 1965.

Mrs. RICHARD SPRAQUE,
President.
Mrs. VERNON L. GARRETT,
Secretary.

Vietnam Report—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished editor and journalist, Mr. John Seigenthaler, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, has been touring the tortured countryside of Vietnam as an observer and writer.

He is writing a series of articles on this tour that provide fresh insight and added perspective into the situation there. I believe these reports will be of wide general interest.

Under unanimous consent, I include this series of articles—published in the Nashville Tennessean—in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The first of this series, Part I, Vietnam Report, is as follows:

TERROR IN THE SUN—VIETNAM: A LAND OF WAR, SIESTAS

(By John Seigenthaler)

SAIGON, May 16.—Something less than 48 hours before this was written I was in the cool, comfortable, and secure offices of the Nashville Tennessean saying goodbye to staff members as I left on this trip.

Now I am halfway around the world in hot, uncomfortable, insecure Vietnam, where life and labor are cheap—and where the U.S. Government spends more than \$1 million a day on the business of war.

As I took my leave from Nashville, Amon Carter Evans, publisher of the Tennessean, shook my hand and we laughed as he asked: "Are you sure you don't want to back out before it is too late?"

Admittedly, that idea has crossed my mind in the 2 months that elapsed since I was invited by the Department of Defense to come and see first hand how the war goes.

I considered declining the invitation last month after Communist explosives blasted our Embassy. I considered backing out again as U.S. airstrikes against the Vietcong and North Vietnam continued to build tension and danger in this part of the world. And I considered it just last week when I read that military officials believe the Vietcong are building up for a retaliatory attack somewhere in South Vietnam. American officials expect the response to come after the start of the heavy rains, later this month.

TWO-WEEK TRIP

I had wanted to come to Vietnam when I was first invited. And while I wavered—slightly, but never seriously—as the situation heated up, I am still extremely anxious to travel across this country, observing and learning what I can about this sensitive and sometimes dangerous war that concerns the freedom of all of southeast Asia—and, perhaps, the ultimate freedom of the world.

It is impossible on a 2-week trip to analyze in depth the problems plaguing any country—much less complex and confused Vietnam. But I hope to observe the effects of the war; to talk with the Vietnamese—the man on the street, the politician, the fighting man; to confer with American civilians working to build the economic structure in this country; to interview American soldiers who are engaged in the direction of the war; the wounded who are cursing it—and to try to bring home a clearer understanding of where we are going in this effort.

And I hope to be able to put to Americans in Vietnam the same question the publisher put to me as I left Nashville: "Are you sure we don't want to back out before it is too late?"

From the air, Vietnam today seems to be a country at peace. We flew in from Manila by commercial airline—as casually as if we were flying from Memphis to Nashville. The very fact that commercial airlines still fly the daily trip from Manila to Saigon to Singapore was a surprise to me.

Looking down on the lush, green rolling hills and valleys, Vietnam seems not unlike the countryside in middle Tennessee. The Saigon River, a meandering little stream, curves across the land toward the central city, as does the Cumberland. From 20,000 feet Vietnam looks like just another sleepy countryside.

But suddenly the pilot of the airliner reminds his passengers that there is something more than farmlands and wood and streams below.

"I am required to remind our passengers," he announced over the intercom, "that it is a violation of the laws of the South Vietnamese Government to take any photographs from an aircraft over Vietnam."

Almost every passenger on the half-filled jet strained his eyes, to discover what secret armaments were below. Nothing could be seen. There was no evidence of a war or violence. There were no explosions; no orange bursts of gunfire; no troop movements; no bomb craters scarring the earth.

FRENCH INFLUENCE

I had been told that the influence of the French—for years colonial masters of Vietnam before they were driven out in 1954—is still apparent. And it is. The second language here is French. The huge picture on the wall of the hotel room where I am

now sitting is of the Arc de Triomphe. Many of the buildings reflect the design of the French. Menus in restaurants reflect the tastes of the French and almost everything from bathrooms to teenaged boys named Jacques leave no doubt that the French were here.

But Saigon is poor and dirty and run down, indicating that the French left some of their culture and little else.

The dominant and overpowering influence obvious here now, however, is not French but American. As our airplane taxied to the terminal at Tan Son Nhut Airport, clusters of American-made helicopters could be seen taking off and landing on the outskirts of the field. Giant C-130 cargo planes, clearly marked "U.S. Air Force," line the parking area. Many among the more than 100 planes I saw bore the familiar tail marking of a lightning bolt through a shield. These planes came here from Sewart Air Force Base.

THIRTY-SEVEN THOUSAND SOLDIERS

Everywhere in Saigon are American soldiers. They scramble all over the airport. They fill the sidewalks, the restaurants, the taxicabs—there are 37,000 of them here as of announcement today. American music blares from radios in the hotel lobby.

The square in front of the city's largest Catholic church is named "John F. Kennedy Square." Hotel employees and waiters in restaurants are making a major effort to keep pace with the American mood sweeping the country.

"Welcome to owah hotel," the registration clerk said as he placed a card before another newsman and me. We flew here together. He quickly added: "Sorry. No single rooms. Double rooms only."

Saigon, a city of 2 million, is not a city of convenience. The war has brought people here from all over the world—an estimated 100 newspapermen are now here, most of them on a short-term basis. There is only one air-conditioned hotel and reservations must be made weeks in advance. It is a bustling, busy city as Asian metropolitan centers go. And the sight of so many people moving so fast, going about whatever is their business, can lead a visitor to the false conclusion that this is a city at ease, surrounded by war.

Walk along the crowded streets and observe these native inhabitants—short, slender brown little people, with large almond eyes—and it is hard to understand that this, their community, is alive with terror. Women, wearing the native Ao Dai dress, seem unconcerned as they shop, many of them walking along with their children, hand in hand. A constant flow of tiny taxicabs pours by the hotels on the corner of Tu Do (Liberty) Duong (Street) at Le Loi (the name of a former president) Duong. Hundreds of bicycles, carrying men, women, and children, vie with the cabs for space at the intersection. Nobody seems to be aware, or care that the Vietcong may be somewhere among them, preparing to create new terror, with bombs and bullets.

We arrived just before noon and the road was jammed with traffic as we started from the airport to the hotel. However, shortly after our arrival Saigon closed up shop—as it does every day between the hours of noon and 2:30 p.m. The heat and humidity are oppressive.

OFFICE CLOSED

Custom simply requires that everybody take a nap—a frustrating tradition that American fighting men can't understand. Shortly after my arrival I went to the office for national press accreditation but even this office was closed. Only a janitor was on hand to announce that those who worked in the business office would be back at 2:30.

How strange for a nation at war to go to sleep each day at high noon. And yet I am

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2573

told that tonight in Saigon we will hear the Vietcong mortar fire in the hills.

A careful look around town, however, makes it clear that there is a war. Three blocks from the hotel is the Brinks bachelor officers quarters which was blasted by a Communist bomb last Christmas eve night. Some of those quarters are still under repair. I visited the Embassy to talk with Robert Burke, a member of the staff who is current on political affairs.

All around the Embassy a white barrier of barrels and bars has been put up. This was thrown around the building after the explosion last month which tore into the Embassy. A gaping hole is still only partially filled in the street and the business establishment across the street, which was blown up, still remains an empty hull.

An armed military policeman at the entrance to the Embassy told me he thought Vietnamese officials had delayed repairing the business house so that it would remind the Vietnamese people of the cruelty of the Vietcong in bombing a business owned by one of their own people.

Upstairs in the Embassy Burke conducted a political briefing in the waiting room of Ambassador Maxwell Taylor. The room usually reserved for such briefings, he said, is still under repair.

In front of Thu Vien Abraham Lincoln, the USIA library, there is a barrier identical to the one surrounding the Embassy. There has been no bombing there.

Comdr. Joseph N. Williams, Jr., who is a Nashvillian, and who heads the information office here, said a bombing of the library could come—but the Vietcong would damage its own cause with such a blast.

"Our library is an extremely popular place," he explained. If the Vietcong bomb our library they will be very unpopular in the eyes of the people who enjoy the library's facilities."

And still the barricade is there to make it more difficult for anyone who might decide to attack an unprotected symbol of American democracy.

And so while today Saigon seems placid, there are fresh scars of war—and fear for the future.

Col. Frank W. Chesrow: Papal Chamberlain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the May 20, 1965, issue of the Sentinel, the voice of Chicago Jewry for 50 years, about Col. Frank W. Chesrow, a papal chamberlain.

Col. Frank Chesrow has been president of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago since 1958. He served with the American forces in World War II in Naples where he did an outstanding job in the field of sanitation. For 30 years Colonel Chesrow has served the community of Chicago in many worthwhile charities and is one of the outstanding lay Catholic leaders of our country.

I should also like to mention that he is the son of Italian parents who migrated to this country. Five of their sons became professional people, two doctors, one a lawyer, one a dentist, and

Colonel Chesrow, who is a graduate pharmacist.

It is my pleasure to insert the article about Colonel Chesrow, which follows:

LEAVES FOR ROME—CHESROW USED INFLUENCE WITH POPES TO AID JEWISH SCHEMA

(By Bob Gale and Max S. Steiner)

The constant insistence of one of the Nation's top Catholic laymen may have been responsible for the church's declaration absolving the Jews of delicide, it was learned by the Sentinel in an exclusive interview this week.

Col. Frank W. Chesrow, a papal chamberlain of the Roman Catholic Church, left the United States Tuesday for Rome, where he will be in conference with Vatican officials. Vatican leaders, under the leadership of Cardinal Augustine Bea, are discussing the declaration "with a view toward retaining the strong statement taking the blame for the death of Jesus Christ from the Jews," Colonel Chesrow said, just before leaving for Italy.

He related his "lifelong dream to achieve the great goal of brotherhood, by convincing the Catholic Church to once and for all remove the basic reason for persecution—the alleged killing of Christ."

The colonel said that, "I could not reconcile in my mind blame for the death of Christ with the very fine character" of many persons of Jewish faith whom he has known over the years in his business, professional, and political career. Head of the Chesrow drug family, Colonel Chesrow had been president of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago since 1958.

"I have often marveled to my friends of the great generous heart of the Jewish people, and how they rallied to causes sponsored by religions and people not of their faith," he said. "These people gave unstintingly to many Catholic organizations, institutions, and charities without taking into account the terrible stigma that has been placed upon them in the last two centuries—a stigma that was largely responsible for the callous murder of 6 million of their coreligionists by Hitler's terrorists."

"In my long service as a member of the Catholic lay hierarchy, and especially as papal chamberlain, I have been able to come in close contact with Pope Pius XII, Pope John XXIII, and now Pope Paul. During my tours of duty in the Vatican, I spent many hours discussing first with Pope Pius and then with Pope John the great need for a Catholic proclamation for once and all absolving the Jews of the sin of the death of our Saviour."

"In the last few months," Col. Chesrow continued, "I have been able to convince Pope Paul to follow in the great tradition of his beloved predecessor, Pope John, regarding the declaration on the Jews."

"During my service in the U.S. Army, I fought side by side with Jews, and have always found them to be brave and willing to serve their country. In my civic and political life, I have always found the Jews to be in the forefront of any move for brotherhood—to protect the unity of all peoples who believe in the ever living Almighty God."

Colonel Chesrow was first appointed a papal chamberlain to the Vatican (one of two in the city of Chicago) by Pope Pius XII and was reappointed by Pope John and then again by Pope Paul. He has also earned many other Catholic honors, and is active not only in the causes and organizations of the Italian people, but has interested himself in many other worthwhile charities and communal endeavors.

He is a director of the Association for the Jewish Blind, is a trustee of Israel bonds, and has contributed generously to many other Jewish charities.

The President's Boyhood Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the President and Mrs. Johnson are most concerned with the preservation of all phases of the growth of our great Nation, that future generations of Americans can understand and take pride in their heritage. They are working diligently to save the landmarks recognized as links with the past—not only here on the Potomac, but in all 50 States.

I would like to point out what their home State Texas is doing to support their nationwide project on a statewide level.

The Texas State Historical Survey Committee, State agency for historical preservation, and the Texas Historical Foundation, privately supported, non-profit organization to supplement the State program, are carrying out a dynamic, 5-year plan to save and mark Texas unique past.

No part of Texas history is being neglected, for a basic part of this program is the guidance and leadership of more than 3,000 volunteer workers over the State who are charged with the responsibility of preserving and marking local, county, and State history.

Success of this far-reaching program is measured by more than 3,000 official Texas historical markers which dot the State, giving short "history lessons" to anyone who passes by, a doubling of local history museums in the past 3 years, the saving and restoration of historic structures, and the appropriations by counties amounting to more than \$104,000 for the saving and marking of local history in 1965.

The President and Mrs. Johnson have personally worked on this preservation program in Texas. They purchased in 1963 the President's boyhood home in Johnson City. Restoration of the structure followed with Mrs. Johnson personally handling many of the details. Furniture gathered from the Johnson family, pictures, mementos—all are placed to depict the home of the President's youth.

This past week, the Texas State Historical Survey Committee awarded its official Texas Historical Medallion for the structure, thereby making it a recorded Texas historical landmark, recognized by the State for its significant contribution to Texas culture, history, and heritage.

Directors of the Texas State Historical Survey Committee and Texas Historical Foundation were in attendance as special guests.

Former presentation of the marker was made by Mrs. Stella Glidden, friend of the President and Mrs. Johnson; the invocation was given by C. Ray Akin, minister of the First Christian Church of Johnson City where the President has membership; and master of ceremonies was Arthur Walz, chairman of the Blan-

A2574

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 24, 1965

co County Historical Survey Committee.

The formal address was made by the Honorable Homer Thornberry, judge, U.S. District Court, Austin, Tex., and former Congressman from the 10th Congressional District of Texas, which I now have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, the program for this historic occasion is herewith submitted as a tribute to the President and Mrs. Johnson and their personal preservation of our Texas and Nation's heritage:

THE PRESIDENT'S BOYHOOD HOME—PRESENTATION OF THE HISTORICAL MEDALLION, MAY 13, 1965

MR. ARTHUR WALZ, CHAIRMAN, BLANCO COUNTY HISTORICAL SURVEY COMMITTEE

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to this program. My name is Arthur Walz; I live here in Blanco County and I was requested to serve as master of ceremonies.

In asking for our opening prayer, there are many of us who are acquainted with the wise counsel, the prayers of Pastor Akin have offered to us on many occasions and under many different circumstances. To those of you not acquainted with Pastor Akin, I am proud to tell you that for more than 30 years he has combined the honored profession of teaching with the high calling of a man of God. At the present time he is an educator in the public schools of Austin and for more than 5 years has been the pastor of the First Christian Church of Johnson City—the church in which the President holds membership. At this time I call upon Pastor C. Ray Akin to give our invocation.

REVEREND AKIN

Eternal God, with full and thankful hearts we are assembled in this place; we are conscious of the benefit received as we draw inspiration from treasured memories and associations, thereby gaining uplift of spirit to live more effectively in the present, and to face the future with hope.

We are thankful for the family whose name this residence bears and for the son of that family whose outstanding leadership in our Nation and world is advancing justice and human rights and causing the light of hope to shine for countless thousands of disadvantaged.

Bless this house, O God; grant that to all who enter these premises may come the thrill of being in touch with the living past—a sense of being close to times and surroundings important to all because of their special meaning—for as they touched his life so our lives are touched.

May this home be regarded by all as a shrine to be preserved and cherished as an object of interest and a source of pride.

In Jesus name we pray. Amen.

MR. WALZ

Thank you Pastor Akin for your inspiring prayer.

Ladies and gentlemen, we sincerely and heartily welcome you and we do appreciate your sacrifice of personal time and private affairs to emphasize, and by your presence, testify to the historical significance of this occasion. Many people of local, State and National prominence are here. And, I would like very much to pay personal tribute and recognition to all such distinguished guests and visitors. But, if I used our program time to do this I am sure that I would wind up like Christopher Columbus—sailing on and on and on—and our program would never get started. However, on behalf of the people of Blanco County, I do want to thank publicly: the Governor of our State, the members of the State legislature, the president, directors, committee, and staff members of the Texas Historical Foundation and the Texas

State Historical Survey Committee, the executive committee of the Blanco County Historical Survey Committee and the directors of the Blanco County Historical Association. I wish to thank all of these fine people for their great interest, their hard work and their special devotion in recognizing and in preserving the rich historical heritage of our beloved State. I believe it would be fitting and proper, at this time, to give these fine people a round of applause.

For a long time, ladies and gentlemen, it has been the earnest desire and fond hope of the people of Blanco County to see this boyhood home as it is now; to realize and to know that it will be used to serve our community needs in a great many different ways; and, through the graciousness of its owners, visitation by the public will enshrine its beauty, its charm and its memories in the hearts of all Americans today and forever more. And now the time has come to memorialize this Texas historic landmark and to dedicate the boyhood home of the President. What we say and do here bequeaths to the heirs of eternity a remembrance on the pages of our history in honor of the vibrant personalities identified with this boyhood home.

Ladies and gentlemen, for the award of the certificate of merit and the presentation of the Official Historical Medallion, there has been chosen a gracious lady of Blanco County whose abiding faith in her community and its people has long been recognized by her many friends and neighbors. Though mature in years, this lively lady is very young in heart. She is the editor and publisher of the Johnson City Record Courier newspaper; she is the Postmaster of Johnson City; she is an active member of many civic organizations and the hardest working member of the Blanco County Historical Survey Committee; and, she is a loving and devoted mother and she is a life-long friend of the President and his family. It is, indeed, a singular pleasure for me to present to you the embodiment of the staunch spirit of our early Blanco County pioneer settlers—Mrs. Stella Gliddon.

MRS. STELLA GLIDDON

Mrs. Walz, ladies and gentlemen. I am very pleased at this time to award to the owners of the boyhood home of the President through the official sponsor, the Blanco County Historical Association, a certificate of merit that formally and officially designates this structure a recorded Texas historic landmark. This certificate reads as follows: "The State of Texas, know all men by these presents—that the Lyndon B. Johnson Boyhood Home of Blanco County has been recognized by the State for its significant contribution to Texas culture, history and heritage. This structure has been entered in the State Archives in 1965 as a recorded Texas historic landmark." This certificate is personally signed by John Connally, Governor; John Ben Shepperd, Historical Survey Committee; Arthur Walz, county chairman.

I ask that Mr. John S. Moursund, president of the Blanco County Historical Association, step forward to receive this certificate of merit on behalf of the owners.

MR. JOHN S. MOURSUND

On behalf of the Blanco County Historical Association it is a pleasure to accept this award. Speaking for the association, we wish to thank you, Mrs. Gliddon. This is indeed a historic occasion to participate in the dedication of President Johnson's boyhood home. I predict that this home will be visited by millions of Americans. As a former neighbor, I can truly say that the President spent his formative years in this home, and, undoubtedly, his happiest years.

MRS. GLIDDON

Ladies and gentlemen, this modest frame home achieved its immortality because it has

given to and for the service of mankind a great and forceful Texas legislator—Sam Ealy Johnson, Jr.; a loving and devoted wife and mother whose abiding faith and lofty idealism coronated the highest expression of family love, affection, and guidance—Rebekah Baines Johnson; and an inquiring youth who grew into the inspiring manhood of a free American because he was and still is ready and willing to work and to serve as an American so that freedom may not perish from this earth—our 36th U.S. President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. It is, therefore, with much personal pride on behalf of all of the people of Texas that I unveil and present this official historical medallion as an enduring testimonial to the precious memory of the boyhood home of the 36th U.S. President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

MR. WALZ

Thank you Mrs. Gliddon for such a nice and gracious award and presentation.

Ladies and gentlemen, for the dedication of the boyhood home of the President, our distinguished guest and speaker is a man well known to most of us. If he was some one strange to us, I would be tempted to indulge in a long and flowery introduction. But, during his many years as a public official, as legislator and as the man who succeeded the President in the Congress from the 10th Congressional District, he has eagerly listened to our problems, recognized our needs, acted in our behalf and he has served his people and the Nation with great honor and distinction. It is, ladies and gentlemen, my personal privilege and high honor to present to you for the dedicatory address a personal friend of the President and his family, the judge of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas—the Honorable Homer Thornberry.

JUDGE HOMER THORNBERRY

Mr. Walz, ladies and gentlemen, this is a unique occasion, not only in the history of this Nation but in that of this particular community.

We meet here to witness the marking of this home as a Texas historical site. As the home where the President of the United States, his father and mother, brother and sisters lived among their friends and neighbors in this community, it receives the Texas Historical Medallion.

The President feels that you, the people of this land, have invested over 50 years of interest and love in him. Another humanitarian President, Abraham Lincoln, said over 100 years ago, when he left his neighbors and friends of Springfield for Washington: "To this place and the kindness of these people I owe everything." The sentiment seems appropriate today.

The President and Mrs. Johnson are anxious for you to feel that this house is your house—all of you who live in Blanco County. They desire that it be used for civic functions and meetings of historical societies, as well as for agricultural and youth groups.

It has become increasingly apparent, since he became President, that the whole Nation is interested in the home where our President spent his boyhood. For this reason, the house will be opened to the public. The ladies of Blanco County have volunteered to serve as hostesses. In fact, it is a heartwarming to President and Mrs. Johnson to know that so many friends have expressed an interest in helping with this project.

In the restoration of this home which has meant much to all the members of this family, the President's sister, Mrs. Birge Alexander, has spent much time and effort in seeing to it that the home represents as nearly as possible, the home she remembers as a young girl. Therefore, it is the wish of the President and Mrs. Johnson, as well as Mrs. Alexander, that the home be dedi-

was donated by the Fair Board for the meeting. A stage was erected with a backdrop display of pennants of the eight Lions Clubs in the county, the Rotary Club, and the junior chamber of commerce. The speaker system operated with unusually good acoustics on the balmy spring evening not only inside the hall, but for quite a distance surrounding. This was fortunate as later events proved.

The Clearlake Union High School Band, directed by J. Conner Hill, entertained the assembling crowd. Dignitaries were escorted to their seats in a reserved section and on the stage by the Lakeport Rainbow Girls.

The meeting opened with the playing of the Star Spangled Banner by the High School Band. Chairman Alden Jones acknowledged a letter from the Office of the Vice President of the United States and letters and telegrams from many State and Federal Government representatives who were unable to attend. Mr. Jones then introduced Mr. Earle Wrieden, chairman of the Lake County Board of Supervisors, who, in turn, introduced the following special guests:

State Senator Frank Petersen, Assemblyman Frank Belotti, former State Senator Jack Slattery, former assemblyman Lloyd Lowrey, James Coakley, district representative for Congressman ROBERT L. LEGGETT, State Senator James Cohey, Madera-Merced Counties, chairman of the senate committee on water resources, Lake County Supervisors Don Griner, Lilburn Kirkpatrick, Al Shipley, and Wes Lamson, mayor of Lakeport, Ernest Steen, Art King, editor of Lake Times magazine, and Rotary Club Chairman Coke Marston.

Short talks were delivered by Senators Petersen and Cohey, Assemblyman Belotti, and District Representative Coakley.

Mr. Willard Hansen, engineer and manager of the Lake County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, then introduced the representative of various agencies:

Mendocino County Supervisor Avila; State fish and game, Fred Meyers; State division of forestry, William Miller; U.S. Forest Service, Rod Riley; State soil conservation, Dave Dresbach; Eel River Association, secretary, Bob Moir and vice president, Dave Cox; Redwood Empire Association, Carney Campion; U.S. Soil Conservation Service, Andy Andresen; Corps of Engineers, San Francisco district, Oswald Pietsch; Corps of Engineers, Sacramento, Arnold Zimmerman; Department of Water Resources, Dick Lalletin, Gene Serr, Gordon Dukleth, Guy Fairchild; U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Robert J. Pafford, Jr., Vernon J. Hansen, Joseph E. Carson; and Yolo County Supervisors Bill McDermott and Dudley Stephens.

The main address of the evening was then given by Robert J. Pafford, Jr., entitled, "A Preview of Reclamation's Northwestern California Plan."

The official attendance count within the hall was 1,050. At this point, Earl Fuqua, fire chief, would allow no additional audience to enter the building. Crowds listened to the program outside each of the building entrances. The cloverleaf was filled with people. This is a paved section outside the building used for square dances, etc. The parking facilities filled within the fairgrounds and for blocks around. These facilities ordinarily accommodate crowds of 2,000 persons. It was necessary for the law enforcement officers to turn back the remainder of the cars sending them away for lack of room.

It is estimated by the fire chief that approximately 2,100 persons heard the program and approximately 600 more were turned away. The town has a population of 3,400 persons. The entire county population is only 17,000 scattered over 1,256 square miles. The attendance represented 12 percent of the county population or 59 percent of the city population. This event occurred

during Public School Week with several open houses on the same evening.

The following communications were received at the Lions Eel River Committee office from the following:

Office of the Vice President of the United States.

U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

Congressman ROBERT L. LEGGETT, Member of the Fourth District, California.

Congressman DON H. CLAUSEN, Member of the First District, California.

Congressman HAROLD T. JOHNSON, Member of the Second District, California.

Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, Member of the Third District, California.

Congressman WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Member of the Sixth District, Ohio.

U.S. Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman, Subcommittee on Public Works, Louisiana.

U.S. Senator PAT McNAMARA, chairman, Committee on Public Works, Michigan.

Congressman JOHN H. FALLON, Member of the Fourth District, Maryland.

U.S. Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

Lt. Gov. Glenn M. Anderson.

Assemblywoman Pauline L. Davis, member of the second district.

Assemblyman Jesse M. Unruh, speaker of the assembly.

State Senator Hugh M. Burns, president pro tempore.

State Senator Joseph A. Rattigan, member of 12th Senatorial District.

Edward G. Chandler, consulting water attorney.

Thomas E. Wales, Jr., consulting civil engineer.

Frederick A. Meyer, department of fish and game.

Lloyd Lowrey, former assemblyman.

The following is an excerpt from a report directed to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, by Joe E. Carson, chief of planning, northwestern California water plan: "Because of the great importance of this meeting, the report has been incorporated as part of a scrapbook of material to form a historical account not only of the meeting itself, but also of the planning and promotion which went into it.

EEL RIVER COMMITTEE, LAKE COUNTY LIONS CLUBS,
ALDEN H. JONES, Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, certainly all of these gentlemen and the Lake County Lions are to be commended on this public service.

Korea and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Wednesday morning, May 19, 1965:

KOREA AND VIETNAM

President Chung Hee Park of South Korea is in a position to view problems in Vietnam with the perspective of an Asian leader whose own country knows well the peril and the agony of Communist aggression.

His talks with President Johnson in Washington, and their joint expression of unified purpose in halting the Communist tide in

Asia, are of timely significance as U.S. air raids on North Vietnam are resumed and the crisis in southeast Asia enters a new phase of intensified uncertainty.

"We cannot and should not budge even an inch from defending freedom," President Park advised in his address to the National Press Club Tuesday. He emphasized that, while there are some differences between the situations in Vietnam today and in Korea 15 years ago, there also are notable similarities. In South Vietnam, as in South Korea in 1950, Communists are trying to expand their empire by conquest. Tactics employed in Vietnam are vastly different from those used in Korea but the objectives are the same.

It is a good idea for Americans to bear in mind that the Reds in Korea did, eventually, come to the conference table, after being reluctant to do so for a long time, and the war was ended by negotiated settlement. The negotiations were painfully prolonged, it is true, and the outcome was not entirely satisfactory. Nevertheless, agreement was reached and South Korea remained free of Communist domination.

Fruitful negotiations may still be possible in Vietnam, even though the present prospect seems dim. The most effective way to obtain negotiations is to convince the Reds that they will be denied victory on the battlefield in South Vietnam as they were in South Korea.

President Johnson took the occasion of President Park's visit to Washington to issue a warning to the Communists not to misconstrue conflicts of opinion in the United States. "Let none anywhere falsely assume," Mr. Johnson said, "that the debate freedom permits reflects division on the decisions and decisiveness which duty to freedom may require."

Leaders in Hanoi, Peiping and Moscow should heed President Johnson's words. They would make an extremely grave mistake to interpret free expression of differences among Americans, on matters of foreign policy, as an indication of weakness.

It was Communist miscalculation of America's strength and resolve in 1950 that brought on the Korean war.

As Ho Chi Minh and his associates in North Vietnam listen to the sound of falling bombs upon their military installations, and tally up the frightful cost of futile aggression, they ought to refresh their minds on the pertinent lessons of recent history in Korea.

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2581

SAFETY IN AUTOS

Also, if Americans abroad refrain from purchasing expensive works of art and jewelry, and so forth, this can have an effect. We have made a specific legislative proposal that the duty-free allowance for Americans returning home be reduced from \$100 wholesale to \$50 retail, and we think this will have a beneficial dollar-saving effect, and also a psychological effect.

Question. What do you do about people who abuse the privilege of sending back duty-free packages valued at not over \$10?

Answer. There has been some abuse. These have been tested by sample audits.

The conclusion so far has been that the abuse has not been too important. Now this, I think, will have to be reexamined, if there is a reduction in the duty-free allowance on returning travelers, because the abuses could become more significant.

Question. As to travel abroad, there seems to be some confusion. You do urge people to travel in the United States. Do you take the next step and urge people not to travel abroad unless they have business reasons to do so?

Answer. No. The Federal Government proposes no restrictions on travel.

Question. Will you straighten us out on just what the official position is on travel abroad?

Answer. We leave it to each American to determine—in light of his own personal situation, his business situation, and the national-interest problem—whether a trip should be taken.

All we're attempting to do is to bring the facts of the national problem to his attention, so that he can consider them along with his personal and business reasons. But if his decision, after considering all the facts, is that the trip is desirable, then there's no Government position that would discourage that trip in any way.

We can't possibly try to make the millions of decisions in those cases, and we're not attempting to.

Question. Does a person need to feel guilty about it, if he's planning to take a trip to Europe this summer?

Answer. Not at all. But if he decides he is going to take a trip, we have the additional suggestion that he use American-owned facilities to the extent possible, and that he keep down his purchases while abroad. This apparently is a suggestion that pleases most husbands, but some of the wives are not so pleased.

RESTRICTIONS ON TRADE

Question. Mr. Secretary, a few weeks ago you said you would meet with automobile manufacturers to discuss speed and other factors involved in auto safety. What would you like to see done in this area?

Answer. Frankly, I don't know. I think that this whole question of safety in the production and use of automobiles on public roads is of growing importance to us as a nation. Since we in the Department of Commerce do have responsibility for the public roads program, and also have the responsibility for relationships with the business community, it seemed to me to be a good idea to arrange a meeting and discuss the whole question of safety.

There are those—in Congress, particularly—who think that perhaps we should control the automobile manufacturing industry to the extent of specifying just what automobiles can and cannot be built. On the basis of all the information available to me now, I would be opposed to any such move.

On the other hand, highway accidents are resulting in more deaths every year, and the figures on the number of young drivers who will be on the highways in the next 5 to 10 years are staggering. Therefore, I think it's an area where the Government can stimulate more thinking among the automobile manufacturers about building in some more safety devices and, on a voluntary basis, to see if this problem can't be brought into sharper focus.

I just have no idea specifically as to what might emerge from these discussions. For a while there was a horsepower race, and then that was submerged in the interest of economy and safety and various automobile characteristics. But, in the last year or so, there seems to be growing emphasis on speed and on the size of automobile engines. It seems to me that some more thought should be given to the question: Is this a wise policy for the automobile manufacturers to follow, in the public interest and their own interest?

Question. On a number of occasions you have urged businessmen to broaden their responsibilities. What do you have in mind?

Answer. For many years we have watched both labor unions and Government widen their responsibilities—and their power and influence have grown apace. By voluntarily increasing its responsibilities and human concerns, business today is gaining a more influential voice in our national affairs.

President Johnson has asked the help of American business and he is getting it—the voluntary program on the balance of payments is an outstanding example. Growing business involvement in a broad range of serious problems is having the most salutary effect on our entire national life.

The new spirit of cooperation between business and Government can be a decisive force in the pursuit of our national objectives. I think the same sense of partnership that is helping to solve the balance-of-payments problem can be applied to job development and other critical national needs. In the social and economic gains, everyone will benefit.

Summary of Lions Eel River Development Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, for years we have talked in California about diverting a portion of the Eel River south

through Lake County, Lake Berryessa, and points south.

All admit that the current God-made diversion must be changed inasmuch as the last northern California Eel floods will cost the Congress millions of dollars to correct the damage.

To show the enthusiasm for the suggested manmade change of geography diverting the Eel River through Lake County, Alden Jones and the Lake County Lions, recently held a public meeting with Robert Pafford, western Director of the Bureau of Reclamation as speaker.

A summary of the meeting follows:

SUMMARY OF LIONS EEL RIVER DEVELOPMENT MEETING

Because of the urgent need for better control of water in the Eel River development area, many citizens felt that immediate action should be taken now—not in 25 years. The ingredients were there, but it took the eight Lake County Lions Clubs, headed by the Lakeport Lions, to mix them together into what is believed to have been the largest, and certainly most impressive, water meeting held in California.

On Tuesday, March 23, 1965, the idea was broached at the Lakeport Lions Club meeting. The club approved the idea and chose a committee. Alden H. Jones was appointed chairman, Bruce Bruchler, secretary, and Hal Stuart, treasurer. On March 26, the committee met and started movement toward a public meeting to be held April 28, 1965, at the Lake County fairgrounds. Mr. Robert J. Pafford, Jr., regional director of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, would be asked to present the most recent and comprehensive northwestern California plan.

An office in downtown Lakeport was donated by County Supervisor Wes Lampson. Telephone service was installed courtesy of Pacific Telephone Co.; lights and heat were courtesy of Pacific Gas & Electric. A salaried secretary, Dee Barnett, was employed by the board of supervisors. Five thousand printed flyers, 250 quartercards, and 3,000 convention-type badges with inserts, "Remember Eel River Day, April 28, 1965, I'll be there, will you?" printed on them were used to publicize the event. A resolution declaring April 28 as "Eel River Development Day" was adopted by the Lake County Board of Supervisors.

Letters of invitation were sent to State and Federal representatives and heads of all agencies connected with water development inviting them to take part in the meeting.

Extensive newspaper and radio coverage was given throughout the Eel River Association area. The five county newspapers cooperated splendidly on publicity.

The Lake Times magazine printed a special "Eel River Development Day" edition. Editor Arthur King and his staff worked long hours writing the Eel River material for the edition. The cover picture was provided through the courtesy of the Northwestern Pacific Railroad; several inside pictures were provided through the courtesy of the Eureka Newspapers, Inc. The Times staff prepared special ads for each of the 88 advertisers. Each ad contained the slogan "Remember Eel River Day, Wednesday, April 28, 8 p.m. Fairgrounds, Lakeport—Build Now—Save Millions."

On the day of the meeting, several private aircraft were used in the shuttling service between Sacramento and Lakeport to transport the dignitaries, who, otherwise, would not have been able to attend due to their busy schedules. The dignitaries met and had dinner with the committee and other invited guests before the public meeting.

The main program was held in the large exhibition hall at the Fairgrounds which

Vietnam Report—Part II

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOE L. EVINS JV

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Seigenthaler, the able editor of the Nashville Tennessean, is continuing his penetrating reports on Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent, I include the second in the series—published in the Nashville Tennessean on May 18—in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article—part II—follows:

**VIETNAM WAR: NO EASY, CHEAP, QUICK WAY
OUT**

(By John Seigenthaler)

DA NANG, May 18.—The cost of the U.S. struggle in Vietnam is soaring—in terms of men, money, and machines of war—and at this point there is no quick, easy, or cheap way out.

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2583

Ten days ago, when I came to Vietnam, 30,000 U.S. fighting men were in the country. There are now 42,000 here—with more reportedly on the way. Another 35,000 Navy men are stationed on ships offshore in the South China Sea.

Now the number of American soldiers, sailors, and Marines dead in Vietnam has crept over 500—5 were slain in 1 attack yesterday—and many more will die in the days ahead. As the monsoon season comes in late May, American air strikes will be curtailed and the enemy—the Vietcong—will become bolder. Then the U.S. casualty list certainly will increase.

I sat today in a jeep at the end of the runway at the huge airbase here and watched flight after flight of U.S. jet fighter-bombers roar from the airstrip and peel off toward the north.

"The birds are flying today and the Vietcong will get hurt," said Lt. Col. Harry Howton, of Birmingham, Ala., formerly based at Sewart Air Force Base, who was with me on the Da Nang flight line.

"It makes me feel damned good watching those birds fly," said Howton. "We let the Vietcong shoot at us all over this country before we hit back. Now it is our turn and we are hitting back."

Howton, the colorful (his men call him Harry the Horse) commander of the 311th Troop Carrier Squadron, is in charge of transporting cargo to rural outposts north and south of Da Nang. He is a commander who believes in taking his turn at flying and when he complains of Vietcong gunfire it is from firsthand experience.

Seven planes he has piloted have been hit by small arms ground fire.

"I wouldn't say getting shot at scares me," said Howton, "but it makes me apprehensive as hell."

With us on the flight line here was Capt. M. E. Bottington, air information officer at Da Nang, who pointed to four jets which were lining up on the strip, preparing to take off.

"Those four planes represent about 6 million American tax dollars," Bottington said, "and that figure, of course, does not include the highly skilled American pilots who are flying the planes."

During the day I saw about \$100 million worth of jets take off from Da Nang. Still later I was back on the flight line when the "birds" began to come home to roost—their bomb and rocket racks empty.

I had hoped to talk with some of the pilots, just back from air strikes. But I was not permitted to do so. I was told that there had been no air opposition to the strikes today; flak, for a change, had been light; small arms fire from the ground had been heavy. No planes were lost today—but 43 have been lost over the last 3 months.

The exact number of aircraft on this base is a classified military secret. But as we drove along the edge of the airstrip I saw more than 200 airplanes, of every type: jet fighter bombers; B-57 jet bombers; jet escort fighters; C-123 and C-130 cargo planes; armed and rescue helicopters; light single and twin engine observer planes; and single engine Vietnamese air force Skyraiders.

This airbase is crowded with planes—and so are the other two major bases in South Vietnam at the Bienhoa airstrip 15 miles south of Saigon, and at Tan Son Nhut Airbase at Saigon.

Fly over any one of the three major bases and you can see that planes overcrowd the parking ramps, wingtip to wingtip.

"It concerns me that we have so many eggs in one basket," a high-ranking Air Force officer told me during a briefing at Tan Son Nhut last week. "We need to spread some of these airplanes out in other areas—but we just don't have the landing strips to take care of them."

And Harry Howton told me of a recent accident here at Da Nang that cost a Vietnamese pilot his life—and which could have caused widespread death and damage.

The young Vietnamese pilot, his Skyraider loaded with rockets, was preparing for take-off when his plane suddenly went out of control.

"It rammed one of our C-123's parked on the ramp and we had a big explosion and fire," said Howton. "Fortunately we were able to segregate these two burning planes before the fire spread to any others. It could have been very nasty."

The Vietnamese pilot managed to get out of his cockpit—but he died on the wing of his plane.

Da Nang Air Base is located in a sprawling valley surrounded by mountains. It occurred to me that this field and the planes based here, are sitting duck targets for Vietcong hidden in the hills. I said so to Captain Bottington.

We drove into the hills. Almost every foot of ground is occupied by U.S. marines, armed to the teeth, and with tanks and artillery.

Army engineers have carved red clay roads out of the sides of the mountains overlooking Da Nang Air Base.

And on top of one of the mountains we found another multimillion-dollar U.S. investment. On the perimeter of the mountain clusters of radar-controlled Hawk missiles glare out over the countryside. In an air-conditioned cakelike shack, covered completely by sandbags, was the communications center. Three marine technicians sit in this darkened little cave around the clock, scanning three radar screens for incoming enemy aircraft.

This is only one of several such installations, ringing the Da Nang Base and protecting the U.S. aircraft on the field below.

A marine lieutenant who took us around the armed missile site explained that should enemy airplanes dare attack the base the Hawk missiles would destroy them many miles and several minutes before they reached Da Nang.

"They say Ho Chi Minh has only about 30 or 40 Migs up there," said the officer, Lt. G. R. Modigliano of Trenton, N.J., pointing to the north. "If Uncle Ho wants to lose them, we will be ready and willing to show him how."

From high on this mountain, and even from the airstrip below, American might seems invincible—almost uncontested. But, unfortunately, this is a strange war—unlike any military struggle in the history of the Nation. To win will cost more money—more lives.

The air strikes have certainly had a military impact and they have lifted the morale of American fighting men here. But these strikes can offer a dangerous and misleading conclusion to Americans at home.

Anyone who thinks this war can be won simply from the air is mistaken, according to every military source I have talked with while in Vietnam.

For this is a shooting war—and the bullets are flying both ways. But it is also a political war, a psychological war, and an economic war.

The enemy, the Communist Vietcong, is clever, elusive, dedicated, and ruthless. American soldiers who have come up against them describe them as well trained, well armed, and fearless.

They wear no uniforms—usually a black pajama-type garb also worn by farmers or peasants. Sometimes during an attack Vietcong are clad only in khaki shorts.

Actually, the Vietcong control much of the rural countryside. They are fed arms and ammunition and, lately, some crack troops from North Vietnam. They draft the sons of South Vietnamese peasants and farmers into their forces. They move into

towns and hamlets where the South Vietnamese Government is weak—and after a series of coups there are many such towns and hamlets. They preach and lecture against the Americans and against the government in Saigon.

Many who resist are kidnaped or murdered. The Vietcong concentrate on killing province and district chiefs loyal to Saigon and friendly to the Americans. They also often kill schoolteachers, and others who control and lead community opinion.

The daily briefing sheet prepared for newsmen invariably carries reports such as this one put out a few days ago:

"The following are examples of recently reported Vietcong outrages:

"1. Quang Nam, April 23. The hamlet chief was murdered and 3 civilians kidnaped when an estimated 15 Vietcong entered Phu Phong village.

"2. Phu Yen, April 25. Seven youths were kidnaped by a Vietcong platoon.

"3. Tay Ninh, April 24. The chief of Suoi Nguon hamlet was murdered by an unknown number of Vietcong.

"4. Tuyen Duc, April 17. Five civilians were kidnaped from a new life hamlet by a Vietcong platoon."

When the Vietcong attack outposts where American teams of "advisers" are located the assaults usually are well planned and supported by heavy Vietcong artillery fire. Invariably the assaults come at 2 or 3 a.m., under cover of darkness. The Vietcong hit, murder, and move on.

By the time the government is able to move in reinforcements, they have evaporated into the countryside, or into surrounding villages where they pose as peasants.

U.S. officials have noted a sudden marked increase in Vietcong defectors since the air strikes against Vietcong forces and against Hanoi territory.

There are reports that in some hamlets the Vietcong have recruited women and teenage boys to travel with them through the back country, to carry food and equipment—and after clashes with United States and South Vietnamese soldiers, to bear away and bury Vietcong dead.

In some areas where the Vietcong had been strongest in past months, and where air strikes have been successful, intelligence from civilians, formerly friendly to the enemy, has picked up.

The change has been slight—but it is certain, U.S. Army advisers reported last week.

This is the enemy. And while air strikes will hurt his morale and cut his supply lines along the Ho Chi Minh Trail in neighboring Laos, such attacks will not beat him, American officials candidly admit.

On the other side, the South Vietnamese Government has suffered. There has been great political turmoil—change after change after change in governments.

It is doubtful at present if the average peasant knows or cares about the present chief of state, Phan Khac Suu, or the present prime minister, Phan Huy Quat.

These men have come to power almost as unknown factors. Suu has little background to commend him to the high post he now holds. Quat is an able, dedicated old-line politician.

While he is not a man who seeks headlines, or projects an image to the people, Americans think he has the capabilities of making a go of South Vietnam—if he is given time.

And it will take time. This means that American forces are going to have to be in South Vietnam for a long time while Quat builds an image for leadership, and, more important, builds his country and its armed strength.

How long?

No American I have talked with, including Ambassador Maxwell Taylor and Gen. William C. Westmoreland, will hazard a guess.

But it will take a long time. Americans who have felt a sense of elation over the success of the air strikes should not anticipate an early miracle. The boys won't be home by Christmas, probably not by Easter, and maybe not by the following Christmas.

I came here as a newsmen to ask questions and find out about the war and the nation with which we are allied. But everywhere I have gone, American soldiers and civilians, learning that I have so recently come from home, ask the same questions over and over: "Are the folks at home behind us? Are they willing to stay with this fight all the way? Do they have the patience?"

They are not satisfied with the only answer they can get: at this point there is no way to tell whether the American people recognize that a long, difficult struggle is ahead.

There is no debate here—as there is in the United States—about negotiating a settlement that will get Americans out of Vietnam. Americans here feel a settlement would give away the investment on which the United States has made payments.

Nobody here talks of peace—not even the Vietnamese who have been at war with each other more than a decade.

Recently, a small group of South Vietnamese began circulating a peace petition. After several weeks there were only a few hundred names on it. Three of the people who organized the petition were escorted by the government forces north to the 17th parallel and pushed into North Vietnam.

I talked with a U.S. Information Agency officer, who was disgusted with student demonstrations in the United States against the war in Vietnam.

"Freedom is at stake here," he said. "Don't they realize that? They should be given the same treatment that those petition signers were given."

He added: "I don't understand just what is happening in the minds of people at home."

And, I told him, a big part of the problem is that Americans at home do not understand what is going on in the minds of people here.

Report From Selma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter from the Reverend Charles N. Arlin, of St. Ambrose's Church, in Groton, N.Y.

We have heard many reports from Selma, from all kinds of people and from varying viewpoints. Mr. Arlin's letter, I believe, represents a sincere and objective analysis of the thoughts and reactions of one who was there during those troubled days, and I commend it to all of my colleagues:

ST. AMBROSE'S CHURCH,
Groton, N.Y., April 30, 1965.

Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The following will be my observations on Selma, Ala., which I promised in an earlier letter to forward to you once the pressures of the Easter season relented somewhat.

The Negro problem is a difficult and complex problem; it will not be solved overnight

because people do not yield easily their deep-seated prejudices. Many well-meaning people, unfortunately, consider the Negro as something less than human. At best, in many areas, the Negro is paternalized; so long as he stays within certain bounds, he is accepted to some degree. But he is still subject to the whim of the white man.

I found Selma a shocking experience; I was not prepared for what I saw. When I left for Selma, I knew only what I had read in the press reports; this was, at best, precarious information. I knew that the situation was tense and bitter but this somehow still did not prepare me for what I saw nor for the demonstrations of which I was a part in Selma. The city itself looked as though it were under siege; State Police cars lined streets adjacent to the Negro community and helmeted troopers, city police and Sheriff Clark's possemens were very much in evidence.

Selma is a beautiful city. We were immediately struck by the incongruity of the white area, resplendent with its fine homes and beautiful lawns as opposed to the dirty shabby area which contained in many places shacks, in which many Negroes were living. Many of the streets in the Negro area were unpaved; many of the Negroes were living in abject poverty. I was struck by the odor of hatred and fear on the part of the white population; it was so thick that you could almost cut it with a knife. There was, of course, overt hostility toward those of us in clerical gab. Some of the comments about us made our hair stand on end. We were often referred to as "nigger lovers"; those who used the phrase meant it in the most derogatory sense.

The discipline of the southern Negro was nothing short of phenomenal. There was a strong sense of submerging immediate desires for a larger and more important goal. Even the children were a part of this. Every person in the community submitted to the inconveniences and the discipline imposed and expected without question. Not once in the 2½ days there did I hear a child cry; this in itself is an example of the incredible discipline, maintained despite the constant threat of physical danger and reprisal. In an age when people are prone to give in to short-range demands and shrug off discipline imposed for a long-range goal, I found this nothing short of amazing. The standard reply of the Negro to the query of what he wanted was, "Freedom—now." They also added that their fight for freedom was not only on their behalf but also on behalf of all minority groups who have suffered discrimination in one form or another.

We were housed in the Negro ghetto with Negro families. This was an experience for me, because I had never stayed with a Negro family before. When we protested that we were disrupting family routine, we were told that this was the least that could be done to show appreciation for our presence in Selma, that our presence there meant more to them than we would ever know. We were warned not to leave the Negro community and venture into the white area of the city. To do so would have been very dangerous and might have endangered our lives and safety. As a result of this warning the only contacts that we had with white people, aside from the Roman Catholic priests and nuns at Good Samaritan Hospital, were the city police. I was much impressed with Dr. King's Southern Leadership Conference; the people directing the demonstrations in Selma struck me as responsible leaders who did an admirable job of briefing and controlling the people who poured into Selma. We were ordered to avoid violence at all costs and any and all attempts at provocation. And there were attempts at this. However, we were warned to steer clear of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, primarily because they were prone to provoke

violence; as students, they often rushed in "where angels fear to tread." They gave little heed to consequences or to planning.

Mr. Wilson Baker, public safety commissioner of Selma, was the only police officer in Selma who had the respect of the Negro community. Sheriff Clark, I soon discovered, was a man who tried to escalate a situation into violence; on the other hand, Baker did everything in his power to prevent violence on both sides and he was genuinely concerned that everyone be given equal protection. Clark and the mayor of Selma, however, had contrived to limit much of Baker's authority as commissioner and Baker and Clark were at odds on how the situation should be handled. Baker wanted to avoid violence at all costs; Clark would have liked nothing better than violence. The clergy, from what I saw and observed, did their best to assure that there would be no violence and that all of the demonstrations would be peaceful.

On the day that we were arrested (Wednesday, March 17) a group of Dr. King's people had called the mayor of Selma and asked for an appointment. They wanted him to sit down with them and a group of clergymen and discuss the situation in the Negro community. The mayor refused, I understand, in rather colorful language. At that point we were asked if we would be willing to go to the mayor's house and set up a peaceful protest. We were to picket his refusal to sit down and discuss the grievances of the Negro community. We agreed, but not without some fear and trembling. If we succeeded, we would be the first group to demonstrate outside the Negro community, except, of course, for the marches to the courthouse. We knew that one of three things would happen to us: we would be allowed to peacefully picket with the protection of the police; we would be arrested; or we would be subject to physical violence on the part of the enraged white citizenry because we had carried the protest into their own backyard. This we later found to be a very sore point with the white people in Selma. So long as the demonstrations were taking place in the Negro ghetto or at the courthouse, the white people were not bothered. Most of them could ignore the situation. But they felt severely threatened when the protests were carried into the white residential area.

We were transported to a spot about a block from the mayor's home; there we alighted and lined up two abreast on the shoulder of the street. As I recall, at that particular point there were no sidewalks. We had barely begun to move when a police car cut us off and we were told that we could not march; there was a city ordinance forbidding it. At that point the news cameramen arrived and began filming the situation and Mr. Baker arrived, visibly angry. He informed us all that we were under arrest and that transportation would be provided to the jail. This was in fact provided by Sheriff Clark and his possemens in a schoolbus. Clark himself took command of the bus and when some of the group began to sing a freedom song on the bus, Clark vowed that he would just as soon kill all of us and go to hell for it. You only had to look at his face to know that he meant it.

We were treated most courteously by the local police. When we arrived at the jail we were ushered into the courtroom where we were informed that Mr. Baker had changed the original grounds for arrest to parading without a permit. We were originally arrested for unlawful assembly and illegal picketing. Bail was set at \$200 per person and we were told that as soon as we had been booked, we would be allowed to sign out on our own recognizance. Most of us did this, although some, not in our immediate group, argued that if we were protesting unequal treatment, it would make sense that we stay

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2585

in jail rather than be released on our own recognizance. Had we been Negroes it would have been hardly likely that we would have been accorded the same treatment. But, we felt that we had made our point; Baker had made his. There was no point in pursuing the matter any further at that particular juncture. Inasmuch as we had our plane reservations for the trip from Montgomery to Atlanta that evening and had promised Bishop Higley that we would return on Thursday, we felt it best to leave.

This, in essence, is what factual part of our story which has been so badly bungled by the newspapers. We went to Selma, not to get arrested, but because a certain segment of our population was being denied the right to vote. People can argue about racism and all of the other issues that they may wish to drag across the path, but many of them have lost sight of the fundamental reason for the trip to Alabama. We felt that man, as a creature of God, has a dignity which cannot be suppressed by whips, clubs, guns or intimidation of any other sort. A human being has the right to live without fear as a constant companion.

I cannot speak for the march to Montgomery, but in Selma I saw none of the activity which has been claimed by the Congressman from Alabama. I saw no drinking of wine, beer or liquor while I was in Selma, although I did see a large quantity of soda pop consumed. Could it be that these cans were mistaken for beer cans? I personally saw no evidence of promiscuity. In fact I was amazed at the discipline of all those who were in Selma and I am certain that none of the people involved in the demonstrations would have jeopardized the Negro cause by careless, unheeding behavior. It was a known fact that every attempt possible would be made by some people unsympathetic with the civil rights movement to discredit by any means possible the demonstrations in Selma and Montgomery.

As to conclusions about the situation in Selma, I would say the following: The situation there is far worse than I had imagined it to be. Yet, I have a feeling that the majority of the people in Selma and in Alabama deplore the violence which has taken place there. Though they may not be in sympathy with the civil rights movement, they realize that there has to be a change in the attitude toward the Negro. There still is discrimination in many forms in Selma—including the churches. There appears to be discrimination on the part of many police officers in the city; following the fiasco at the bridge in Selma there also appears to be some basis for the charge of police brutality. Certainly the Negroes in Selma do not have the same opportunities that their white counterparts have. The literacy tests for voter registration have been so rigged that no one, white or black, could have passed unless the registrar was so inclined. I doubt that I could have passed such a test if they had not wanted me to vote. There is strong need for a voting rights bill which will guarantee people the right to vote. I personally have no objections to literacy tests as a qualification to vote provided that such tests are fairly administered to any person regardless of race, creed, or color. The great crime in Alabama is that the literacy test has been used as a barrier—often an illegal one—to prevent Negro applicants from becoming qualified voters. The poll tax should definitely be outlawed; no voter should be barred from voting because of a tax imposed.

I have nothing but the highest praise for Mr. Wilson Baker, the public safety commissioner of Selma. Although he is a segregationist, this man is a highly competent police officer and he is genuinely concerned with keeping the peace and protecting people on both sides of this issue. To this end, I

am certain that many of the arrests that Baker and his men have made in Selma, including our own, while ostensibly on a legal pretext, have in fact been made to protect those arrested from the possibility of violence at the hands of those who might resort to violence. Sheriff Clark I do not consider a competent police officer; he has created far too many situations and then tried to escalate them. I personally consider him a crude and vulgar individual who has grossly misused his police powers. He has little regard for the safety or dignity of the people of Selma. I cannot say much about Colonel Lingo and his State police; I had little personal contact with them. But they have no respect among the Negro community. The wrong people in Selma wore the hard hats when we were there; no one attacked them. The Negroes and marchers should have had the hard hats. Wilson Baker has been the only officer who has been able to go into the Negro community and carry on a meaningful dialog. He alone has the respect of the majority of people on both sides in Selma.

Finally, I am not certain where the Negro revolution is headed, but it is a revolution, a peaceful one at present. There are some aspects of it that I don't care for, because I, too, have ambivalent feelings as a white man. But nothing that I or anyone else chooses to do will stem the relentless tide of freedom for the Negro. Whatever happens, it will cost the white man some pain and many white men don't want the pain. They don't see why they should have to suffer; but aren't all white men to blame in some way for the situation as it now exists? America will never be completely free until all of its citizens can enjoy the guarantees of the Constitution. No citizen will ever be a responsible citizen until he is given the opportunity to be one; freedom entails an awesome responsibility. It is not license to do what we will; it is not license to abuse the rights of fellow citizens. No country has ever been free until it has granted responsibility and then met the problems one at a time as they came up. I am certain from my observations of the Negro determination in Alabama that if the Negro is not treated as a first-class citizen and given the rights which go with this, no matter how much pain it will cost the white man, then the Negro will resort to more drastic measures. Then, God help us all.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES N. ARLIN.

Former Immigrant Gives Six-Story Office Building to Philadelphia Opportunities Industrialization Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in these days when "battle, murder, and sudden death" play such a prominent part in the daily news, it is refreshing and encouraging to read the absorbing story of a dedicated and grateful citizen who has contributed so generously to aid the self-help program of the West Philadelphia branch of the Opportunities Industrialization Center. The extremely interesting story of Mr. Sol Feinstein, a Bucks County, Pa., farmer, as

published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 2, is as follows:

EX-IMMIGRANT GIVES JOB CENTER BUILDING AS TOKEN OF HUMILITY

(By Helen Rothbardt)

When the Opportunities Industrialization Center dedicates its West Philadelphia branch at 3 p.m. Sunday, there will be a small, nearly bald 77-year-old man in the crowd. It hasn't been publicized, but he gave the OIC the six-story office building at 17 South 52d Street for its new training center.

Sol Feinstein insisted on anonymity when he offered the building rent free for 10 years, plus \$20,000 to renovate it, to the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, pastor of Zion Baptist Church, and organizer of the OIC.

But the Bucks County farmer made a stipulation: at the beginning of each year, he was to be paid "one slice of black bread and one cup of black coffee without sugar."

DECLINES TO EXPLAIN

Curious newsmen pressed, but Mr. Sullivan would not reveal his name nor explain the symbolism.

"Then a nosy reporter had to track me down," said Feinstein resignedly in the rambling home on his 200-acre farm at Washington Crossing, Pa.

He explained the symbolism of the consideration asked for his gift.

"It is a symbol of humility—my humility. I knew hunger, poverty, and bigotry when I arrived in America with an Indian-head penny in my pocket. There was a time I was glad to have black bread to eat."

ARRIVES IN STEERAGE

That was in 1902 when Feinstein, a boy of 14, arrived in steerage and went to work in a sweatshop in New York.

He fingered his shabby workclothes. "Look at me. Do I look like anything but a farmer? I just came in from work—I am a farmer."

And how did a farmer get involved in this unique program that primarily serves jobless Negroes?

Feinstein explained: "I read about what Mr. Sullivan and the other Negro ministers were doing to train people and I wanted to meet them."

MANY APPLICANTS

The OIC began its work on January 26, 1964, in a former police station at 19th and Oxford Streets. The self-help program was swamped with applicants for vocational training. The first center was started with a \$50,000 anonymous donation and equipped with gifts from industry. At the end of its first year, the center was established as a practicable program, affording new hopes and opportunities to thousands.

Feinstein explained, "I told Mr. Sullivan it was all well and good to train people in the production fields. But I thought there was a need to train them in the distribution field. Without distribution, production doesn't mean a thing. But first of all, people have to be taught how to dress and act and talk to customers. I specified that the new job training center should concentrate on the merchandising field."

MAKE GEARS MESH

The program got underway through meetings with executives from center city stores, the chamber of commerce, the city administration, and others. Working with them was Feinstein—now a member of the board of trustees of OIC.

"We all worked together to make the gears mesh," he said.

The new center, in the heart of West Philadelphia's bustling 52d and Market Streets shopping district, will concentrate on training in all phases of merchandising. The first

A2586

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 24, 1965

two floors of the building will be a complete merchandising mart, composed of shops offering clothing, furniture, appliances, and other items for sale to the public. The upper floors will be used for training classes in buying, selling, secretarial training, real estate salesmanship and other phases of merchandising.

CONTINUE PROGRAM

"In the six-story tower of training," Mr. Sullivan said, "we're going to continue our business of helping people help themselves. We want our people to be able to qualify for and get jobs as buyers and sellers and clerks in the big department stores in the city."

OIC, which plans to open another center in Germantown soon, received a \$458,000 Federal grant last December.

Feinstone is presenting one more item to the building. It is a plaque which will read:

"Our great country was built by the underprivileged of many lands; by Indian tribes who came before us, by the persecuted Pilgrims, by indentured servants, by Negro slaves, by the genius and blood of the Fathers of the American Revolution and by the 30 million underprivileged immigrants from all parts of the world who came after the Revolution and help build our country in freedom."

DONATES LIBRARY

Feinstone also donated the David Library to the Washington Crossing Memorial Building. In it are Feinstone's collection of more than 600 original manuscripts and war letters by George Washington and other patriots.

Last February he presented to the library of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., a letter written by George Washington from his headquarters there on October 5, 1779, to Gen. James B. Lambert.

Tribute to Spencer Ravel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1965

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the post Sputnik decade has dramatized to the country the importance of secondary education in our highly specialized and increasingly technological society. There has been greater emphasis upon technicians and science orientation among our high school graduates, who then may be directed toward 4- and 5-year university level courses which are largely removed from the humanities and basic liberal education of the whole man.

Yet there has also been a reappraisal and a reevaluation of the educational process, with the realization that there can be no replacement for the individual attention accorded the student about to enter this age of the technician and the specialist. Those who are fortunate enough to receive this consideration, and the patience and understanding which are found in great educators and administrators, are indeed fortunate.

In the community of Hamburg in my district, Mr. Speaker, young people have been among those who have been afforded that special attention—the element of secondary education which will

have an influence on the lives of our citizens and leaders of tomorrow.

Recently the Hamburg community gave its special thanks to this educator, Spencer W. Ravel, in a dinner tribute attended by students, faculty, staff, former students and townsmen. Mr. Ravel has completed a quarter of a century as an educator, principal and friend in the Hamburg schools system.

Spencer Ravel, besides serving his country as an educator—perhaps one of the most important in this period of our Nation's history, has also served her well as an officer. During World War II he was in the Normandy invasion, and later during the Korean conflict was recalled to active duty. He is presently commander of a Naval Reserve unit in Buffalo and instructs a Reserve program weekly.

Perhaps the finest tribute to this educator and friend came from the collection of some 500 statements and letters from former and present students, typical of which were:

You have given us your time and patience so that we may go into the world as young ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following editorial which appeared in the Hamburg Sun subsequent to this community tribute:

TRIBUTE TO "SPEN" RAVEL

Last Saturday, some 300 students, faculty, and staff members at Hamburg Central High School gathered to pay tribute to Spencer W. Ravel, longtime high school principal and friend to most of the postwar graduating classes here.

The expressions of appreciation found elsewhere in this week's Sun capture the esteem which he has earned over the years, and to which we could supplement only by affirming a similar sentiment from the civic community.

"Spem" Ravel, as educator and administrator, has played a prominent role in guiding and molding the direction of young people from the Greater Hamburg community. His is a contribution which will long be felt in those persons he has aided, who in turn assume their responsibilities and leadership.

Perhaps the student tributes were best summed up by this: "Thank you for always smiling and saying 'hello.' Thank you for making Hamburg High School a school I can be proud of. Thank you for all that you have done and all that you will do for us. I hope that in the future we will always remember to say, 'Thank you, Mr. Ravel,' and if we don't always say it, I hope you know we mean it in our hearts."

Vietnam Report—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Seigenthaler, able editor of the Nashville Tennessean, is continuing his penetrating reports on Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent, I include the third in the series—published in the

Nashville Tennessean on May 19—in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

BA DUA SHOWS FIGHTING SCARS,
BRAVE WARRIORS

(By John Seigenthaler)

BA DUA, VIETNAM, May 19.—My visit to this rural outpost in the Mekong Delta was supposed to be another brief, routine visit with an American soldier who has a family back in middle Tennessee.

Then American bombs began falling on a Vietcong encampment 3 miles away. It was still a brief visit—I was at Ba Dua only an hour. But it certainly wasn't routine.

I had asked the Defense Department to arrange for me to see as many men as possible from Tennessee during my 2-week visit to Vietnam, and they obliged. One of those I was to see was Capt. David L. Pemberton, stationed at Ba Dua, whose wife, Martha Anne, and 5-year-old son live in Clarksville.

The next thing I knew I was on my way to Ba Dua (pronounced Bah Zooah) 55 miles south of Saigon and the helicopter pilot was saying to me: "We will have to go in very high and then drop down fast right beside the fort."

"Why is that?" I asked.

"The Vietcong are still around this place," he said. "You don't want to give them anything to take a pot shot at, do you?"

His question didn't seem to warrant an answer. I began to wonder if Captain Pemberton really had anything to tell me, after all. Then we were dropping down out of the sky and Pemberton was coming out to meet me.

"Welcome to scenic Ba Dua," he shouted above the roar of the helicopter. The pilot said he would be back in an hour and asked that I be ready. Then he went up and away.

"We don't think it is wise to just leave a helicopter sitting here on the ground for any length of time," Captain Pemberton told me as we walked toward his fort. "It might give the Vietcong some ideas and they might get reckless."

Ba Dua is a South Vietnamese showplace. Until last November the village and the adjoining fort were a Vietcong stronghold. Then the government forces took the enemy Vietcong by surprise and drove the Communists away. Twice since then—in December and again in January—the Vietcong have attacked and tried to take back Ba Dua. Both times the government forces have held on and they still are in control of Ba Dua.

"We are now beginning to spread our circle of influence wider and wider," Dave Pemberton told me. "We have patrols out every night, keeping on the move. We keep the Vietcong guessing. We can't sit here on our tails and be taken by surprise."

The fort is located on a little elevated knob in a clearing surrounded by thick jungle underbrush. A half-dozen zig-zagging rows of barbed wire surround the fort and a short distance away new hut-like buildings are going up.

Pemberton pointed out over the area to where the village is located. "They are good people, the Vietnamese, I like them. They have been kicked around a lot by the Vietcong. But they know things are going to be better for them."

The captain turned his back on the village and pointed in the opposite direction. "We get good intelligence from the villagers and they indicate that there are some Vietcong out there about 2 or 3 miles," he said. "We have given that information to the district and we are hoping to get an air strike out there."

Pemberton didn't know it, and neither did I, but at that moment three American B-57 jet bombers were on the way.

I began to talk to Pemberton about his family at home in Clarksville. His wife, he told me, was the former Martha Anne An-

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2587

derson, a native of Clarksville and she and little David live now with her mother, Mrs. Gordon Anderson, at 925 Crossland Avenue, in Clarksville. Mrs. Anderson, said the captain, is employed by McNeal & Edwards Department Store in the children's department.

"I'm crazy about middle Tennessee," said Pemberton, a native of New Orleans and a graduate of West Point. "I might like to live there some day."

Suddenly, as I was asking him questions, Pemberton called to one of his men, a sergeant.

"Go get Dai-uy Ro," he shouted. "We are about to have an air strike." He stood up and pointed out to the area where earlier he had told me the Vietcong were supposed to be located.

"Look at those planes," he said to me. "We are going to get them. Our information was correct. They are going to hit right out there."

A light, single engine L-5 observation plane was circling low over the heavy brush area where Pemberton had earlier said the Vietcong were located. High above that observation plane three B-57 bombers were circling.

The sergeant, D. C. Rock, of Chambersburg, Pa., was back on top of the fort now with a Vietnamese dressed in a T-shirt.

"This is my friend and my fellow officer," said Pemberton. His name is Dai-uy Nguyen Van Ro." I shook hands with Captain Ro and Pemberton pointed out the planes.

At about this time the three B-57's started to dive. They came straight down toward earth and at the last second, at treetop level, they pulled out.

"I saw their bombs," shouted Pemberton. Others inside the fort began clambering up to see the airstrike. The planes were well up in the air when the first explosion rocked the earth where we were standing. The explosion sounded very loud. There were three of them on that first pass.

"I like it, I like it," Sergeant Rock shouted. By this time the planes were making a second dive. Again they zoomed down to the tops of the trees, then straightened up—and again the three thundering blasts shook the ground.

"What a show," said Pemberton.

I looked at the Vietnamese captain. He was smiling. "What a show, indeed," he said. For about 15 minutes we stood on the top of the fort as the planes made perhaps 20 passes.

Each time they came down they unloaded bombs, and there were shattering blasts.

Once, after they passed, there was a second, louder concussion.

"They got something good, then," said Pemberton, "that was a secondary explosion." Shortly afterward smoke began to climb from the forest area. Pemberton said he was certain that some of the explosions had been napalm bombs.

The airstrikes created considerable excitement in the fort. It continued even after the planes had gone. I got back to my interview of Pemberton. He told me who the men were stationed with him. Rock, and the two other Americans, Lt. Robert C. Johnson of Greensburg, Pa., and Sgt. Milton Pollock of New York. Both of them were away from the fort during my visit.

I asked Pemberton about his Vietnamese counterpart, Ro.

"I have heard all sorts of things about the Vietnamese fighting man, but in my opinion you can't give them too much credit. This man is the best. And those he leads are very good."

"Ro's brother was killed by the Vietcong," said Pemberton. "And maybe that makes him a better soldier. At any rate, he is very, very able."

Before I left Saigon I had interviewed Gen. William C. Westmoreland and he had told me that his men in the field, working as advisers to the Vietnamese, "are some of the most dedicated men the Army has ever seen."

"They are working with missionary zeal with these people," Westmoreland said. As I talked with Pemberton I realized that he was one of those about whom Westmoreland was talking. He is tough, bright and completely involved in the business of winning this unusual war by helping make the South Vietnamese better soldiers.

I told Pemberton that many Americans didn't look upon American soldiers in Vietnam as "advisers" but as warriors.

"Well there are four of us Americans here," he said. "I am a battalion adviser. I suggest. I offer ideas. I give advice. And Dai-uy Ro works well with me. We have a good relationship. But he leads."

"There are men just like me all over this land," said Pemberton. "Some of them may not be as fortunate in having a good man like Ro at his side. But all of us are faced with the job of giving advice—not orders. Any American who doubts we are advisers should come out here and take a look, and try to understand," he said. "Sure if we get shot at we shoot back. But that doesn't make us any less advisers and it certainly doesn't make us any less soldiers."

He took me around the fort—which he called "Ba Dua Hilton." The living quarters were underground—tunnels cut out of the clay earth. Two Vietnamese soldiers were operating a radio—one of them churning a manual generator.

Pemberton shone a flashlight into a darkened room where a group of soldiers were sleeping. "They were on patrol last night," he said. In his own quarters he showed me the hammock bunks the Americans have put up along the walls.

"When we first got here we used sleeping bags on the floor," he said. "This is a little more comfortable. He has a tape recorder and he and his wife exchange tapes, in addition to daily letters."

"The mail comes pretty regular," said Pemberton. "It takes about 5 days going and coming."

Outside Pemberton showed me "all the conveniences of home"—his bath: a dirty canal where each day he bathes. "It may look murky to you—but it looks just great to me," he said. About 50 feet from the fort a small hut is located where a Vietnamese woman operates a restaurant.

"I call it the local Howard Johnson," said the captain. He showed me Captain Ro's fighting cock, and the fort's pet dog—a mongrel which has been named "Sambo Molotov."

We sat down in the underground mess hall and Pemberton had beer with ice sent in from the Howard Johnson.

He talked about the unique nature of the war.

"This is really psychological war, with the Vietcong," he said. "We call it psy-war because they are constantly trying to confuse and mislead the people." He lit up the short butt of a cigar he usually clamps between his teeth, and he told about a Vietcong ambush that had taken place April 3 when 10 of the Vietcong soldiers had been killed.

"Outside the two attacks the Vietcong made trying to take Ba Dua back," he said, "that thing April 3 was the worst we have been hit."

Two of the dead, he said, were captured. When it became apparent that they were anti-Vietcong, their hands were tied behind them and they were beaten to death. Two others captured were later released, Pemberton said.

"They kept them for about 3 weeks and they pumped them for information," he said. "During this time they fed them well and fattened them up so when they came back they would tell our soldiers about how well the Vietcong treat them."

Pemberton said when the soldiers came back they told everything they had told the Vietcong.

"Among other things they wanted to know, was who was here for the Americans. They took my name and the names of the others. We later heard they were offering rewards for us. They want to pay about 99,000 piastros for me. That makes me worth about \$700," he laughed.

He told of a recent incident in which a Vietcong girl tried to lure government soldiers into a Vietcong trap. She was identified as a spy, however, and the plot was foiled.

"This is a trick they try sometimes," he said.

Government soldiers killed her, said Pemberton. "They showed her corpse to the villagers and they said: 'Look here. She was with the Vietcong and this is the fate of all those who help Vietcong—death.'"

I asked Pemberton if he condoned this type action.

"I don't condone it, but I don't condemn it, either," he said. "This is the Vietnamese way of fighting a war. She would have lured some ARVN (regular army) soldiers to their death. They beat two of our men to death. This is war. I'm an adviser and they don't ask my advice on something like this. And I don't offer it. I think all of us are harder who have been out here for awhile."

Back on top of the fort waiting for the helicopter Pemberton pointed out four huts going up nearby. "That is going to be a new life hamlet," he said. "The government is building it. The army is doing the work on it. Two days ago it wasn't there. Part of psy-war is to get the people to work to help themselves."

"There are many things being done—a pig program; new farming techniques are being taught; medical advice is being offered—the army inoculated the children awhile back. The school, which was practically closed during the time the Vietcong were here, is now back open."

A favorite project of the Vietcong has been to murder teachers who talk to the children about freedom or in favor of the government and against communism.

"Much of the good that is being done is attributed by the people to the Americans," said Pemberton. He told of one incident in which a Lutheran church in Madison, Wis., sent clothing to the villagers of Ba Dua.

"Now my mother has a similar project going at the Lutheran church in New Orleans," he said. "It makes a great difference to these people. They know where the assistance comes from."

Pemberton said in recent days he has noted an increase in the intelligence he has received from villagers. He attributes some of this to the air strikes which the people have heard about.

"We know, for instance, that we have 13 mines in roads around here somewhere. We had 14 until yesterday when we found one. We still don't have the exact locations of all the mines. But I think we'll find them."

By now the helicopter was coming to take me away. I shook hands with Dave Pemberton, Sergeant Rock and Captain Ro.

"Tell the folks at home I'm well and safe," said Pemberton. "And come back to see us again sometime when you can bring those lovely B-57's with you."

And so, as the helicopter lifted me quickly into the air and to the north I said farewell to scenic Ba Dua.

A2588

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 24, 1965

Armed Forces Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by an address delivered on the occasion of Armed Forces Week by Joseph A. Califano, Jr., the special assistant to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense, at the Armed Forces Week luncheon at the Sheraton Hotel, in Philadelphia, Pa., on May 14, 1965. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the text of this significant message:

ADDRESS BY MR. CALIFANO

Armed Forces Week is primarily an occasion for honoring the men and women, past and present, who have worn the uniform of our country. There could be no more appropriate place to offer such tribute than the city of Philadelphia. This city's contribution to the military history of America is older than the Nation itself.

The first body of troops assembled to defend the 13 American Colonies, the nucleus of the Continental Army, consisted of two companies of riflemen from Virginia, two from Maryland, and six from Pennsylvania.

When George Washington rode north to assume command of the new Continental Army, he was escorted out of Philadelphia by the Light Horse of the city of Philadelphia, which we know today as the 28th Infantry Division of the Pennsylvania National Guard.

This history was very much in President Johnson's mind when he recently addressed the subject about which I will speak this afternoon—the situation in Vietnam. The President said:

"Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change. This is the principle for which our ancestors fought in the valleys of Pennsylvania. It is the principle for which our sons fight in the jungles of Vietnam."

Vietnam is the major challenge which presently confronts this country and particularly the men and women in the Armed Forces. "Some may consider it a small war," President Johnson said, "but to the men who give their lives, it is the last war."

The fact that our forces are supporting the Government of South Vietnam, a small country on the far side of the globe, has generated currents of confusion in some elements of American opinion. Much of this confusion, it seems to me, reflects a lack of knowledge about certain basic facts concerning Vietnam.

There are four principal questions regarding Vietnam which seems to occasion most of this discussion:

Who started the war in Vietnam and how is it being fought?

Why are we involved?

What, exactly, are we doing?

And, finally, what do we hope to accomplish?

To understand the origin of this conflict, we must recall that the Vietnamese are an ancient people who enjoyed independence for several centuries until 100 years ago, when the French assumed control in what is now Vietnam. The Vietnamese people recovered their independence at the end of World War II by successfully resisting the returning French. Unfortunately, as has happened more than once in the postwar world, what may have begun as a broad-based national resistance soon lost control to the Commu-

nists—in this case, the forces of Ho Chi Minh, who in 1930 first organized the Communist Party in Vietnam. Eventually, following the settlement in 1954, the Ho Chi Minh forces were given undisturbed control of the territory north of the 17th parallel. South Vietnam, in turn, was to be given an opportunity to conduct its own affairs in peace unaligned and apart from the global power struggle.

The United States, under President Eisenhower, attempted to assist the peaceful development of South Vietnam through economic aid and advice. In the 5-year period from 1954 to 1959, we saw concrete evidence that South Vietnam was beginning to achieve its objective. More than 140,000 peasant families were given land under an agrarian reform program; the transportation system was almost entirely rebuilt; rice and rubber production surpassed all previous highs in South Vietnamese history; and construction was underway on several manufacturing plants.

At this juncture, the Communist leaders in Hanoi launched in earnest their program for the so-called liberation of South Vietnam. In September 1960 the Third Congress of the North Vietnamese Communist Party formally called for a maximum effort to liberate South Vietnam and for creation of a National Front for the Liberation of the South—the organization which became the political arm of the Vietcong. To the Ho Chi Minh Communists, liberation meant sabotage, terror, and assassination. It meant attacks on hamlets and villages. It meant the systematic, coldblooded murder of thousands of schoolteachers, health workers, local officials, and their wives and children.

Yet today, the propaganda apparatus in Hanoi contends that the fighting is an indigenous revolution—a civil war, they claim, not armed aggression. The facts, however, are incontrovertible:

Since 1959, at least 40,000 trained guerrillas—the equivalent of two U.S. divisions—have infiltrated South Vietnam from the North. (And this figure is low, for each infiltration is established by two Vietcong prisoners, two captured documents, or one of each.)

Guerrilla terrorists, last year alone, killed or kidnaped 9,759 Vietnamese civilians—men, women, and children—who had no official connection with the Vietnamese government. If this had happened in the United States, it would have meant, in proportionate terms, 143,000 citizens slain or kidnaped every year.

Guerrilla terrorists last year also killed or kidnaped 1,536 village chiefs and other local officials in an organized effort to destroy the government's power to function and to protect its citizens.

A combat unit of the regular North Vietnamese Army—the 2d Battalion of the 101st Regiment of the 325th Division—is now operating in the central highlands of South Vietnam.

A major element of the North Vietnamese Army—the 70th Transportation Group—exists solely for the purpose of moving infiltrators from north to south.

We have captured or sunk Communist vessels off the shore of South Vietnam laden with weapons and hundreds of thousands' rounds of military ammunition.

The South Vietnamese Army has captured Chinese and other Communist bloc arms and ammunition in virtually every area of their country.

The war in Vietnam is not a war as we have known war. It is not a conflict where conventional military forces face each other across a traditional battlefield. It certainly is not an internal rebellion fought for the benefit of the unfortunate people on whose land it rages. It is thinly concealed aggression—with the unconcealed objective of subjugating an independent people.

The next question which arises is, What does all this have to do with us? Is saving Vietnam worth the American lives that have been lost and the dollars that have been spent to provide economic and military assistance to a small nation on the other side of the earth?

Three American Presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—have answered this question with a resounding "yes." And for many reasons; the most obvious reason is that South Vietnam is a member of the free world family and has asked for help to preserve its independence. As President Johnson has said:

"Around the globe from Berlin to Thailand are people who use well-being rests in part on the belief that they can count on us if they are attacked. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of an American commitment and in the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war."

Another reason for our support is that Vietnam is truly a test case of what the Communists call wars of liberation, and what we know to be externally directed terrorist subversion. In Secretary McNamara's words:

"We may be certain that as soon as they had established their control over South Vietnam, the Communists would press their subversive operations in Laos and then in Thailand, and we would have to face this same problem all over again in another place or permit them to have all of southeast Asia by default. Thus, the choice is not simply whether to continue our efforts to keep South Vietnam free and independent but, rather, whether to continue our struggle to halt Communist expansion in Asia. If the choice is the latter, as I believe it should be, we will be far better off facing the issue in South Vietnam."

The next question, then, is, What are we doing to stop the aggression? First, we are continuing the effort which began several years ago—we are assisting the South Vietnamese with economic aid, with agricultural experts, with engineers, and with doctors and nurses and medical supplies. But this aid cannot be truly effective in an atmosphere of terror designed to create anarchy.

The first requirement of any government must be the ability to control its territory and protect its people. The guerrilla terrorism rampant in South Vietnam must be met and overcome. We are assisting the South Vietnamese to accomplish this internally with arms, materiel, and military support and advisers. At the same time we recognize that the guerrilla terrorism in South Vietnam is inspired, supported, and controlled by Hanoi. This is the reality, and we have determined to face that reality. We are taking action both to weaken their effort by forcibly curtailing the flow of men and supplies, and to impress upon the North Vietnamese that continuing aggression will be costly.

We are taking this action with great reluctance after the most careful consideration at the highest levels of our Government, the most specific warnings to Hanoi, and the persistent accumulation of outrages by North Vietnam against South Vietnam and Americans located there. The record of the past year is one of the greatest examples of patience and restraint in the face of extreme provocation. Let me review that record.

On February 9, 1964, the Vietcong exploded bombs under the bleachers during a softball game in Saigon, killing 2 Americans and injuring 23, including 7 women and 1 child. One week later, the Vietcong attacked a movie theater, killing 3 Americans and wounding 35, including 9 women and children. This kind of terrorism persisted in South Vietnam throughout 1964, yet the United States took no action to retaliate.

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2589

The first air strike on a North Vietnamese target by American planes did not occur until after two attacks on our own ships in the Gulf of Tonkin last August. On August 2, 1964, North Vietnamese boats attacked the U.S. destroyer *Maddox* in international waters off the Gulf of Tonkin. We took no military action against North Vietnam. Our only response was a clear statement by the President that we intended to exercise our rights to be in international waters, and the dispatch of another destroyer to the Gulf of Tonkin to reaffirm our rights under international law.

North Vietnam boats again attacked our destroyers 2 days later, on August 4. At this point, the United States retaliated by air strikes limited to the naval bases which were the home ports of the boats and an oil storage area which supported them. Our retaliation was appropriate and fitting. It did not extend beyond August 5. As President Johnson said on August 5, "We still seek no wider war."

There were no U.S. attacks on North Vietnam between August 5, 1964, and February 7, 1965—a period of 6 months. During this period, the President reaffirmed his desire for peaceful settlement. "We are willing to go anywhere, any time, talk to anyone, and try to reason together for peace," he said. "We would rather talk than fight."

The Vietcong responded to this restraint and these peace overtures by intensifying their acts of terrorism. On November 1, 1964, they attacked the Bien Hoa Airfield, killing 4 Americans and wounding 72. On November 18, 1964, they bombed a snack bar in Saigon, wounding 18 Americans. On Christmas Eve, they bombed the Brink Hotel, killing 2 Americans and wounding 64. Still we took no action.

Finally, on February 7 of this year, the Vietcong attacked the barracks and airfield at Pleiku, killing 9 Americans and wounding 107. As a result, U.S. planes attacked the North Vietnamese Army barracks at Dong Hoi and Chap Le. Again, we made it plain that this was a limited response to a specific attack. As the President said at the time, "The response is appropriate and fitting. As the U.S. Government has frequently stated, we seek no wider war. Whether or not this course can be maintained lies with the North Vietnamese aggressors."

The Vietcong response came on February 10 when they attacked the U.S. enlisted men's barracks at Qui Nhon, killing 23 Americans and 7 South Vietnamese, and wounding 21 Americans. Once again, we responded in a limited fashion by bombing the Vietnamese Army barracks at Chap Le and Chanh Hoa on the following day.

For 3 weeks there were no further attacks on North Vietnam by our planes. The Vietcong, however, continued in their acts of terrorism. Accordingly, at the end of those 3 weeks, on March 2, we struck the Xom Bang ammunition depot and the Quang Khe naval base in North Vietnam.

Again we paused in our raids, and no air attacks were carried out against the North for the next 11 days. During that period the Vietcong exploded a bomb in a bar frequented by U.S. personnel in Saigon, killing two Americans and three Vietnamese, and wounding five other Vietnamese. The Vietcong attempted unsuccessfully to bomb another U.S. barracks in Saigon.

In short, Vietcong terrorism continued unabated, and has continued up to the present day. As a consequence we and the forces of South Vietnam have been obliged to engage in a continuing program of strikes designed to disable the infiltration apparatus in North Vietnam and to lead the regime in Hanoi to abandon its aggression against the South. In this program we have specifically limited ourselves to military targets to avoid civilian casualties. The raids have

been frequent, but so have our indications of willingness to talk. And, unfortunately, so have the acts of Vietcong terrorism.

On March 19 a bomb in a loaf of bread exploded, wounding four Americans in Saigon. On March 30, Vietcong terrorist exploded a 250-pound bomb in front of the U.S. Embassy, killing 2 Americans, including 1 woman, and 14 Vietnamese, and wounding 48 Americans and 106 Vietnamese, many of them innocent bystanders. On April 4, a Vietcong terrorist was apprehended at the Grand Hotel at Danang carrying a plastic explosive which he intended to use there. On April 14, Vietcong terrorists exploded a bomb in an ammunition storage site at Qui Nhon, wounding 31 Americans. On April 19, a Vietcong terrorist exploded a bomb in a bar frequented by U.S. personnel in Ban Me Thuot, wounding four Americans.

Only last weekend, the Vietcong mounted their largest offensive in more than 2 months. They overran the capital of Phuoc Long Province, occupying the town for more than 6 hours before being driven off by Government forces. Five Americans were killed, and 13 were wounded.

During this entire period, the President has continued to state unequivocally our willingness to seek a peaceful settlement in Vietnam by talking "to any Government, anywhere, and without any conditions." The President said, as recently as last week:

"We will lay aside these weapons when peace comes—and we hope it comes swiftly. But that is in the hands of others besides ourselves."

"For months now we have waited for a sign, a signal, even a whisper, but our offer of unconditional discussions has fallen on unresponsive ears. Not a sound has been heard. Not a signal has been sighted. Still we wait for a response. Still America is anxious for peace."

From Peiping, on the other hand, comes either silence—or active denunciation of the peacemakers and the idea of negotiation. On the anniversary of V-E Day, for example, we find the official Chinese Communist publication, *People's Daily*, warning that "it is absolutely impossible to gain through talks what is not won on the battlefield."

The issue in Vietnam is clear. The Communists are determined that there shall be no government save on Communist terms. The answer to the fourth—and final—question I have posed is equally clear: Our objective in Vietnam is to assure that a people with the will to remain free and independent shall have their chance to do so. More than 50,000 soldiers of South Vietnam have been killed or wounded in battle for their country since 1960. Last year alone, the South Vietnamese Army suffered 25 percent more battle casualties, proportionately, than we incurred in the entire 3 years of the Korean war. And still they fight on. This is a nation which is strongly resisting, not a popular uprising, but a calculated, brutal, and bloody aggression from without.

A great philosopher once observed that those who cannot learn history are condemned to repeat it. The whole history of our century—and, indeed, all history—proves conclusively that the appetite for aggression is boundless. Aggression feeds on its own success. There is no known instance of an aggressor ceasing his efforts to subvert his neighbor's freedom because his appetite was satisfied. If we do not stand by South Vietnam today, then we will surely be called upon to face the challenge elsewhere, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. President Johnson has chosen, with the overwhelming support of the Congress, to face reality and meet the challenge here and now. I know that he has the firm support of the vast majority of the people of this American Republic—a Republic which was born in a revolution to secure the right of people to determine their own

destiny. It is the preservation of that right, and that alone, which is the American objective in South Vietnam.

Vietnam Report—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Seigenthaler, able editor of the Nashville Tennessean, is continuing his penetrating reports on Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent, I include the fourth in the series—published in the Nashville Tennessean on May 20—in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

SOUTH VIETNAM FACE REFLECTS MANY CONFLICTS

(By John Seigenthaler)

The face of South Vietnam reflects many conflicts, many ironies, many moods.

It is a nation at war—and yet, except during a Vietcong raid on a village, or a terrorist bombing in the city—the civilians seem to be a people at peace.

It is an impoverished nation—but strangely not a hungry one. It is an illiterate nation—but not an ignorant one. It is a nation with little self-sustaining power—but with considerable potential.

The men of Vietnam are intense and hard-working—but they insist on taking a nap for 2 or 3 hours every afternoon, war or no war. The women are lovely, sensitive, and fashionable—but they turn suddenly tired and old in their middle years. The children are captivating and charming—but their darting eyes have seen too much and betray minds much older than their years.

Most of all the face of South Vietnam reflects a nation which has lost its political sense of direction and some of its national pride. And if the people seem to be too free from worry it may be because many of them are cynical and no longer care.

It is strange how foreigners, exposed to Americans, pick up the manner of speech of Americans and apply it to their own needs. For example the Vietnamese all across the land, have adopted four English words—"too bad about that"—for their own.

These four words are used to express every Vietnamese reaction to disappointment. An American civilian official working with the aid program in Saigon, told me he has heard the trite phrase used to express Vietnamese reaction "to everything from a spilled cup of coffee to the bombing of the American Embassy."

"I think these people have seen so much that they aren't shocked anymore," he said. "They ask you for a cigarette and you don't have one. 'Too bad about that,' they say. A few minutes later they read in the paper that the Vietcong murdered a hamlet chief friendly to Americans. 'Too bad about that,' they say."

A few days after I arrived in this country I was talking with an American officer in the field and I asked him if he had heard the phrase "too bad about that."

He suddenly became angry. "Shut that up," he snapped. "It is bad enough that we are the pessimistic, cynical people that we are. But we don't have to give it to these people. I hate those words because they show us at our worst—and the Vietnamese at their worst. We are here to try to show

A2590

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 24, 1965

these people how to build themselves up," he said. "And the most popular words we are able to give them tell them how to tear themselves down by not caring. They have got to care."

I thought it was interesting that four simple words of the English language could create such conversation—even such controversy—halfway round the world in this confused country.

And Vietnam is a confused country. It goes beyond not knowing who the enemy is because the Vietcong seldom wear uniforms. It goes beyond the political chaos that has come from a series of coups topping one national government after the other.

For example, there has never been an effective official census count of the people in South Vietnam. It is estimated that there are 14 million people in the country—but nobody knows for sure. There may be 15 million, or 13 million.

An American visitor who travels to various sections of the country is certain to feel lost as he moves from one area to another. But that is not so strange in view of the fact that many Vietnamese feel uncomfortable when they move from one area to another.

There are four separate sections of this country with distinctly different outlooks, different economies, different environments.

1. The Mekong Delta, estimated to be home of half the population of South Vietnam, is the rice bowl of southeast Asia. Here the peasant farmers grow enough rice to feed all the mouths in North and South Vietnam—with enough left over for many American rice puddings. The delta, which also is coconut country, has been the scene of repeated Vietcong attacks.

"The Vietcong want the delta because it will help them feed North Vietnam and the Chinese," an American briefing officer told me. He pointed to two reports turned in on 2 successive days last week. These charts indicated that on Tuesday 22 of 27 harassing actions by the Vietcong occurred in the delta area. The next day 13 of 17 harassing actions by the Vietcong were in the delta.

The delta farmers are poor, but their children are well-fed if not well-washed. Nobody in the delta must do without food. It came as a shock to me to learn that the Vietcong impose a tax on the farmers. I talked with a Government district chief, Ho Van Trinh, of the Cho Gao Delta district.

He is an appointee of the Government in Saigon and holds the rank of captain.

Through an interpreter he told me the Vietcong tax farmers in his district at least 100 percent more than the Government taxes them. If the farmer refuses to pay, the Vietcong may steal his crops, or burn them, or draft his sons.

For this reason, said Trinh, the Vietcongs are not popular in the delta.

What, I asked, do the Vietcong do with the money they collect in taxes from delta farmers? "They use it to put reward money on the head of Americans, working to keep us in the delta," he said.

2. Saigon, the major city and national capital, is completely different from the delta. The people have come to depend more directly on the influx of American soldiers to improve their standard of living.

"The French never paid good tips for any service they received from people who work as waiters or bellboys," said the manager of the hotel where I stayed. "Now the Americans come and they give big tips. Everybody has a higher standard of living," he said.

The taxation of business and business people by the Vietnamese Government in the central city is substantial. A British businessman who is stationed in Saigon told me he pays 25 percent of his income to the Government—"and I get practically not a damned thing for it."

"I get no police protection. The water is bad. The sewerage system is abominable.

The streets are all dirty and they won't collect the garbage regularly. But my firm does well here—and so here I stay," he said.

The Vietcong tries to collect taxes from the cities too—but because the government forces are so strong in Saigon the Vietcong operates subrosa, making demands largely on bar operators who cater to American soldiers. In effect the Vietcong taxes are "protection money" to keep the enemy from tossing a bomb through the front door and blowing up the place.

It has happened several times to bar operators who would not pay. Now the fronts of bars are decorated with iron grillwork—as additional protection against bombings.

Education is becoming more and more recognized as necessary by the South Vietnamese. In 1955, as the French left Vietnam, about 350,000 children were in schools—mostly in the major cities. Now there are 1,200,000 youngsters in schools.

Teaching has been an unpaid profession in Vietnam.

The pay scale is now 1,400 piastras a month. (The official rate of exchange is about 80 piastras to \$1 but the black market rate, which is carried on in every hotel and on the street, runs close to 140 piastras to \$1). By comparison a regular army soldier makes 1,166 piastras as base pay each month.

I visited a school in Saigon. The children were clean and well dressed—not at all like the urchins I found around the hotel and on the riverfront at all hours of the day and night. The teachers were bright women, most of whom spoke English and French.

Saigon is becoming more and more a cosmopolitan city. There are dozens of beggars and street corner confidence men waiting to pluck unsuspecting Americans. There are places to eat and shops to choose from where merchandise is on shelves—but many Vietnamese make themselves at home on the sidewalk, opening their "shops" there, serving and eating food there and at midday, taking their naps there.

3. The coastal area is supported almost entirely by a fishing economy. Fly along the long coastal area from Bac Lieu which is near the southernmost tip of Vietnam, up to Da Nang in the northern section of the country and you can see little fishing vessels offshore that number in the thousands.

Picturesque fishing villages dot the coastline and some of the most delicious seafood in the world is available in almost every village of any size. Along the coast about a third of the distance up the shoreline between Saigon and the 17th parallel is Nha Trang—called "the Riviera of Vietnam."

It has a beautiful beach and a lovely isolated bay. Here the South Vietnamese have established a recreational and rehabilitation center for their armed forces—and there are reports that the Viet Cong also send their men to this area to recover from hardships of war.

An American civilian located at Nha Trang with the U.S. aid program told me he believes there is an unofficial truce in and around Nha Trang and that both sides observe it so that these soldiers can recuperate without fear of attack or capture.

Americans believe that the big leak in the supply of arms coming from North Vietnam to the Vietcong is by fishing boats, along the coast and then inland.

Several large caches of arms have been located near the coast recently—one after a 16-year-old, who has been trusted by the Vietcong, defected to the government.

In an effort to stem the flow of arms from north to south by sea, the U.S. Navy has been aiding the meagre Vietnamese navy in the search of fishing boats.

In 1964, for example, the amazing number of 200,000 junks was checked by officials off the South Vietnamese coast and for the first

three months of this year 47,000 more have been checked.

Of these, 1,850 were detained last year and 518 have been detained this year.

This, of course, creates a bad impression in the minds of the loyal South Vietnamese fishermen who go out each morning to fill up their nets—and who curse the patrol boats which frighten away the fish. The fishermen live a hard, rugged life—but again, the food is plentiful along the coastal areas and while few are rich, few are also hungry.

The hot mountain area of South Vietnam, north of Saigon and in the direction of the Cambodian and Laotian borders, is inhabited by primitive tribes known as the Montagnards. These tribes—there are about eight of them—do not consider themselves Vietnamese, even though they reside within the borders of Vietnam.

They live largely from the land, hunting with bows and arrows. Their dress is usually scant and many of them have considered themselves outside the reach of the South Vietnamese Army draft.

They seem to like Americans and are accepting assistance from U.S. military and civilian personnel. The U.S. aid program has constructed a new technical school at Ban Me Thout—the village considered headquarters of the Montagnard Tribes.

Gradually some of the tribesmen have come to accept military training. They seem to resent the efforts by the Vietcong to lecture them on communism. They have presented a perplexing problem to the Government, only emphasizing the differences in people who make up South Vietnam.

A lieutenant stationed at Ban Me Tuoc, working with Montagnard tribesmen, told me: "I'm sure that Ambassador Maxwell Taylor and Gen. William Westmoreland are having their troubles helping the country get a stable government."

"But," he said, "if they want to know what real problems are, they should spend a week-end up here with me dodging arrows."

He said it in a light vein. But his plight serves to bring home the tremendous difficulties Americans face as they try to bring stability to Vietnam by "winning the minds and hearts of the people."

U.S. forces in Vietnam are working hard to try to understand the Vietnamese—and make them understand that the Vietcong forces offer only tyranny and servitude. It will take a long time to teach the Vietnamese all they must know about democracy. It may take longer than it will require to drive the Vietcong out of this country—and that will be a very long time.

Hoosier Capital's Newest Plus; Classrooms and Test Tubes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of interest has been expressed recently by my constituents in the 11th District of Indiana about locating the proposed new national accelerator laboratory in Indianapolis. The Atomic Energy Commission has indicated that a suitable site for the accelerator would contain at least 3,000 acres, have a large supply of water available, and offer good transportation, communication, housing, educational, and cultural advantages.

citizens, including some in religious groups, who conscientiously believe that they should not be compelled to join any organization of a private nature.

Johnson, in his message to Congress this week, did not make any reference to the constitutional rights of the citizen, nor did he answer any of the objections frequently raised in the past that the right to work is a civil right. In fact, Johnson, although discussing at length a wider coverage of the minimum-wage law, restrictions on "excessive overtime work" and changes in the unemployment insurance program, made no comprehensive explanation of why he wants Congress to eliminate the right-to-work laws of the 19 States. The President's reference to this proposed amendment of the National Labor Relations Act reads in full text as follows:

"Finally, with the hope of reducing conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in various States, I recommend the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act with such other technical changes as are made necessary by this action."

Although the President submitted the drafts of bills for the other changes that he requested, he did not do so with respect to the amendment that would abolish right-to-work laws. He merely said:

"Bills embodying the third (proposal) have already been introduced in Congress."

There is hardly any phase of the problem of labor-management relations about which it could not be said that the issues "for several years have divided Americans in several States." Also, it is rare indeed that an important piece of legislation—such as the abolition of civil rights—does not get any more extended explanation from the Chief Executive than was contained in the message submitted to Congress on Tuesday of this week.

While Congress has been aware of many abuses that have occurred in the exercise of labor union power, it has lately avoided corrective measures. In fact, the amount of pressure exerted by labor unions on Congress and on the executive branch of the Government has been considerable. It is commonly believed that much of the labor union influence is due to the amount of money collected from labor union members and contributed to congressional and presidential campaigns.

The Federal Government, moreover, has been lax in enforcing the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. The labor unions get around some of the prohibitions in the existing law by appointing special committees, but it is well known that the salaries of many of the workers on these committees are paid out of union dues, and the existing statute forbids labor unions and corporations to make any political contributions and defines a contribution as anything of value.

The workers in 19 States who have been free from coercion now may face a compulsory unionization program. Theoretically, a worker who is employed in a business that is not interstate in character could still refuse to join a union under existing State laws. But the phrase interstate commerce has been broadened so much in the recent civil rights law in order to remove racial discrimination in hiring employees that it may be doubted whether any substantial number of jobs in any State could be classed today as outside Federal jurisdiction.

It is indeed ironical that discrimination can be prohibited by reason of race or religion or color but that discrimination is to be permitted as a worker is compelled to join a union or lose his job whenever the union gets the upper hand in any business or industry.

In Russia, every plant or factory is dominated by members of the Communist Party. In America, the law which compels a worker to join a union could perhaps be similarly

utilized to require a worker, in effect, to give his support to the political party which the labor union endorses or to risk the disfavor of union chiefs in the plant where he works.

Youth Needs the Out of Doors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sheldon Coleman, a constituent of mine who heads the Coleman Co., Inc., in Wichita, Kans., has written an enlightening and thought-provoking article in the May 1965 issue of Sports Afield magazine.

Mr. Coleman is thoroughly dedicated to the young boys and girls of this Nation and to the great outdoors of America. I commend the article and his ideas to my colleagues for their consideration:

YOUTH NEEDS THE OUT OF DOORS

(By Sheldon Coleman)

You know, sometimes you have to wonder about intellectual America.

We spend billions building schools, equip these schools with the latest and best teaching equipment and then for 12 years cram science, mathematics, foreign languages and other academic subjects into our children's heads. Those who go on to college get 4 more years of much the same medicine and then are turned out in the world to make a living.

These young men and women are then supposed to be properly equipped to fill a niche in our competitive industrial society and to become a part of the vast team designed to keep the United States on top in the race for space and arms supremacy.

We do a good job in preparing the young men and women for this role in society, but we're overlooking one rather important thing—we forget to teach them what to do when they're not working.

We overlook the fact that they're probably going to work no more than 40 hours a week, perhaps as few as 30. In addition, most will have a long vacation sometime during the year. This means that they should have about 60 to 70 hours a week of leisure time—almost twice as much as the average person's working time. Yet we're doing very little about teaching our sons and daughters how to use this time to keep themselves healthy and happy.

For too many people today, both young and adult, leisure time is a curse. So very, very many fail to find wholesome activities and hobbies that, to borrow a Boy Scout phrase, will keep them "physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight." And one of the chief reasons why so many today take to alcohol, have nervous breakdowns, wind up in mental hospitals and deteriorate morally is that they were never taught in school how to use their leisure hours in some kind of body strengthening, mentally refreshing, wholesome form of recreation.

Oh sure, they had gymnastics in school; some learned to play football and basketball; but these aren't things you do after you get out of school. Did they get a chance to learn of the delights of camping, fishing, hunting, boating, outdoor photography, bird watching, nature study, hiking, and the dozens of other things they could do the rest of their lives? These are the pursuits I believe can

do most to keep America a nation of great people.

I have strong convictions about what the out of doors can do for the youth of our country, particularly in the sense of giving us happier, healthier kids who aren't likely to get into trouble with the law. What I have in mind are such attributes as physical fitness, emotional stability, moral respectability and good citizenship. Boiled down, these things merely mean a proper attitude toward life and toward the society in which the boy or girls lives—something, I'm afraid, a few millions lack these days.

I get the feeling sometimes that we have a tendency to avoid responsibility in these matters. If we worry about it at all, we decide that juvenile delinquency is a problem that should be solved by the schools, the churches, the police or the Government, maybe. But I wonder whether we're not dead wrong in feeling this way, particularly when there's so much proof that we, and I am thinking especially of sportsmen and other outdoor-minded people, could do a lot to keep our youth from going astray.

I discovered that there is positive evidence that real outdoor kids rarely get into serious difficulty with the law. Juvenile Court Judge William G. Long, of Seattle, heard 45,000 cases involving boys and girls over a 20-year period and discovered that not one of these had some wholesome outdoor hobby as his or her special interest.

J. Edgar Hoover, famed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, came up with just as startling a discovery. Case histories of the most-wanted criminals over the years revealed that fewer than 1 percent had ever been Boy Scouts. This is a tribute not only to scouting but to the outdoors as well. The inference is obvious—the outdoor training and experience received by Scouts keep them from deviating from the straight and narrow path and make them proud to be good citizens.

This character-building influence is not restricted to young people alone, either. J. J. Jones, a jailer of Knox County, Tenn., examined the belongings of 10,000 inmates over a period of years and discovered that fewer than 2 percent had owned a hunting or fishing license when arrested.

Surely, statistics like these should make any responsible individual think. And I believe a lot can be done by the individual. I'm sure many parents and grandparents want to do something for the young people closest to them. And I like to think that an adult's responsibility and interest should not necessarily end with his own. Too many boys and girls today don't have parents who care or who have the time to be bothered.

But to my mind, the real answer to this problem is to move the great outdoors into the Nation's classrooms. Or, if you prefer, move the classrooms outdoors, occasionally. By doing this, I am convinced we would see a startling change in the incidence of juvenile delinquency, the lack of physical fitness, and the growing prevalence of emotional disorders. In fact, I have decided in my own mind that such a move is imperative to the future of America and its people.

Let's digress just a moment and look at these projected benefits. What about this business of physical fitness? If you don't think it's bad, ask your son to do a half dozen pushups. If he's on the football team, he'll be able to do it. If he isn't, chances are he'll be lucky to do one. In fact, he probably won't even want to try.

I'm sure that people today, young and old, need more muscular conditioning. Our way of life works against physical fitness. Too many moderns ride to work or school, sit behind desks, operate machinery to do their labors for them, and sit in front of television sets for their spare-time amusement. Those who develop a keen interest in some active

A2606

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 24, 1965

form of outdoor recreation feel better and live longer than those who participate in sports only as spectators.

I'm positive, too, that the blessings of the out of doors are just as effective for keeping all ages on an even keel mentally. In this age of stress and strain, American people each year consume 11 million pounds of aspirin, 17 billion sleeping pills, and so many tranquilizer pills that it's impossible to keep up with the changing figures, in an effort to ease their psychological problems. This hardly sounds as if we were living well-adjusted, carefree lives, does it? Doctors spend countless hours consulting with patients with nothing more seriously wrong than self-induced aches, pains, and anguish.

The solitude of forest or stream, the relaxation of casting a fly over a trout, the honking of wild geese in the sky all serve as soothing sedatives to frayed nerves and weary minds. A noted Philadelphia physician, Dr. Raymond West, recently made the statement that he firmly believes that the United States could dispense with the services of 50,000 doctors if people would fully utilize the blessings found close to nature.

This simply means that persons who get outdoors regularly seldom become patients in mental hospitals, seldom have nervous breakdowns or mental illnesses and are not often people who suffer with ulcers, insomnia or even bad dispositions. Does a man with a 5-pound bass on the end of his line worry that his income tax is due? And whoever heard of a person who needed a pill to go to sleep after following a bird dog all day? What better tributes can we find for the stabilizing influence of the out of doors?

And while I'm at it, I might mention a sort of bonus benefit. The outdoors and the wonderful variety of recreation it has to offer can do a great deal for family togetherness, too. Families that play together in the wholesome atmosphere of wood and water stay together. This closeness brings a respect and understanding that can be credited with reducing juvenile delinquency and even the divorce rate.

Such an outdoor-education program as I sincerely propose for the country's schools could open up a whole new world for many young people. And as these young people develop an enthusiasm for the out of doors, it could mark the beginning of a benign cycle. Suddenly, they would become aware of the need for clean waters, green forests, the protection of wildlife and the preservation of the Nation's soils. They would become conservation conscious and willing to fight for the good things upon which their good life depended through the remainder of their lives.

We need to act and act fast as the demand for outdoor recreation grows by leaps and bounds. Clean water is perhaps one of the most pressing of the various conservation problems, because about 60 percent of all outdoor recreation is water based, and polluted water has little to offer for this purpose.

The loss of streams and lakes has been staggering in the past half century. Industrial wastes, sewage from towns and cities, and mine seepage have ruined fishing, camping, boating, picnicking, and other activities along thousands of miles of streams and lakes. In many sections, economically depressed areas are contiguous with regions of heavily polluted waters. The recreational industry, the No. 1 source of income in many regions, has been almost completely eliminated by defiled streams, lakes, and bays.

It's extremely important that we strengthen present legislation to encourage cities and towns to build adequate sewage-disposal installations. Through Federal and State action, we need to inaugurate a program of restoration for streams already lost to pollution.

We need, too, to take a new look at the management of public lands. President

Johnson has stated: "If we are to do today what tomorrow requires, we must proceed without delay on a national program to set aside the parks and seashores, the wildlife refuges, and the waterfowl wetlands which our future generations will need."

Certainly, because fish and wildlife are vital to so many forms of outdoor recreation, there is a need for more stringent conservation measures to protect these resources.

Now, if I have in any way convinced you as a sportsman that outdoor education would be desirable, or is even necessary, for our 50 million schoolchildren, where do we go from here? How do we go about seeing that every child at least gets an introduction to these leisure-time activities, so that he or she will get to know that there are cool, green forests and clean streams with trout and bass, that there are fishing rods and tents, guns and canoes, birds and flowers, and all the other things that make the out of doors and outdoor sports so fascinating and rewarding?

I think that this has to be a federally sponsored project, with money allocated to help schools set up such a program. I also realize that it will require acceptance by State educational departments and local school boards.

In addition to the legislative needs and the official sanction within the States, trained instructors are going to be necessary to make the effort a success. Already some universities offer courses in outdoor recreation. At Michigan State University, teachers can get graduate credit in outdoor recreation during a summer short course. Other universities would certainly include this training in their physical education curricula if the demand were sufficient.

Outdoor education in the Nation's schools is not something completely new and untried. Right now, about 1,000 school districts over the country offer 1-week outdoor schools as a part of the regular program. Other schools have hunting and fishing clubs and general outdoor clubs. Michigan State University has maintained an outdoor education project for 10 years under the joint sponsorship of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation and the American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association. Through the work of Julian W. Smith, director of the project, the university has gained a tremendous amount of knowledge concerning the best methods and techniques for presenting the out-of-doors to students.

The die has been cast and the trail blazed. All that's required now is public awareness of the need, and the advantages, of outdoor education in the schools and action by school officials under a Government-sponsored program. Sportsmen can help activate this program in a number of ways. Once legislation is introduced, individual sportsmen and sportsmen's clubs can let their Congressmen know their feelings in no uncertain terms. And if and when such Federal enabling legislation is enacted, they can make their influence felt at the State and local levels, too.

The sooner we accomplish our purpose, the sooner the boys and girls of these United States will know, and benefit from, the blessings offered by the out-of-doors.

The Reds Don't Want To Talk About Vietnam Until They Have Conquered It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column from the May 21,

1965, edition of the New York Journal American.

The author, William S. White, has put into perspective precisely what the administration has contended all along.

The article follows:

REDS DON'T WANT TALK ON VIETNAM

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The Communist invaders of South Vietnam have again rejected any possibility whatever of any peaceful solution. They have made it triple-plated plain that what they want is not discussion but rather South Vietnam.

Apparently they never got the message of the splinter in the Senate which had so long pictured them as trembling with eagerness for negotiations—if only bad old Uncle Sam would not be so warlike.

The brief and now happily lifted suspension of American bombing against the nests of aggression in Communist North Vietnam—a suspension for which the splinter had clamored to give the North Vietnamese a chance to show how reasonable they could be—has accomplished precisely nothing. The Communists themselves remain curiously unconvinced of those essentially conciliatory intentions which the splinter had so earnestly attributed to them.

They intend to do what they always intended, and what everybody save our little band of Senate foreign policy experts and criers of peace always knew they intended. They intend to overrun South Vietnam—and then perhaps to negotiate over the body of their victim.

They had at least six previous opportunities for honest negotiation, including one offered by neutralist countries which not even the Senate splinter could describe as mere American stooges.

Thus those Senators who had demanded a halt to an American bombing mission which was manifestly necessary to help defend South Vietnam from unbroken Communist assault have now shown the quality of their wisdom. There is no joy in twitting them. For every one of them is a perfectly patriotic man—if also, in this columnist's view, a mortally wrong man.

Still, the public is entitled to know, for reference when yet other proposals are made, the names of some of those Senators who in months past have in one damaging war or another sniped at a basic and bipartisan policy of three American Presidents not to let armed communism run loose.

Of course they have had a perfect right to do this. But their only alternatives would demonstrably have let down a South Vietnamese people hard-pressed enough as things stand.

Anyhow, one gain has emerged. Only the most credulous can continue to endorse the cliché that the way to bring an open aggressor to an honorable conference table is to tell him in advance he need never stop his aggression.

And other clichés are now receiving attention. One is that our bombing has made us desperately unpopular "in Asia." Another is that we are identifying ourselves as bad white men attacking good dark men. These, to, will wither under the light of reality now shining upon them. It is a light cast by the Asians themselves in the recent meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. And it is cast by such diverse and on-the-spot observers as the 1960 Republican vice-presidential candidate, Henry Cabot Lodge, and a Democratic Senator from Connecticut, Thomas Dodd.

No, the Asians themselves—men of integrity such as Thanat Khoman of Thailand—are not denouncing us for opposing aggression. They are thanking God that we do oppose it. Even minds enchanted with wonderful, wistful pacifist dreams of a world made safe without sacrifice or struggle surely cannot go that far.

May 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2603

in the domain of art. Nothing useful can be given to the soul of art if it contains the least drop of pride or which is lacking in feeling toward others.

THE QUALITIES OF ART ARE WITHIN US

In life, I have always wished to attain this end, and whatever we might say of me or of my art, I have always affirmed and repeated that the qualities of art are only within us and not outside of us. But it is very difficult to recognize these signs. Might it not be the origin of drama and of certain crises?

Today we are, as it were, drowned by quantity and we cannot save the world or ourselves without an aspiration toward quality. There is no law, there is only an interior accord of all the elements of our interior world with the exterior world.

Let us take a look backward into the domain of art: It is not the theory of Cezanne which created Cezanne, it is not theory which created the painter Seurat nor Gauguin. It is not impressionism which created Monet.

Equally, a Rembrandt, or a Mozart, have taken from theories, where they could, what was useful to them. That did not prevent them from being very great. But this is perhaps not the moment to speak to you at great length about art.

I end these few words in commending your work and the cultural life of this great American university.

I express to you also my gratitude for the great honor which you do me.

only to lose it. For years he has been caught up in a cacophony of appeals for his allegiance. Me must by now be bewildered by it all.

The question then: What is in it for him, this long, seesaw battle for power which has been going on around him for so long? The Communists tell him they are saving him from ruthless imperialism and they call the government they want him to embrace a peoples' democracy. South Vietnam troops tell him they are his true friends, that the invaders out of the north merely want to enslave him; and they also tell him they are bringing to him a peoples' democracy.

Have words begun to lose their meaning to him in his puzzlement? Has he come to understand, or rather to believe, there is only one truth for him and that is the business end of a rifle? And in his confusion does he really care who is at the holding end?

Meantime, if he lives past 40 he has reached old age. He probably never has seen a doctor and would be suspicious of him anyway. And the war goes on around him and two sides smother him with their urgings of their special kind.

To the peasant who has lived with this war for so long, and has seen this uniform give way to that uniform, certainly the war can hold little glamor. And what is important and what is not important, depending upon the telling, must by now have lost most of its meaning.

The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the impact of education on culture is one of the most significant aspects of any analysis of an educational system.

Mr. William Benton has dealt with this most effectively in his article "A Personal Report: The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," which appears in the 1965 Yearbook of the Encyclopedia Britannica. He deals with it particularly in chapter VIII about art in the Soviet Union.

Chapter VIII follows:

CHAPTER VIII. "SOCIALIST REALISM": ART
AS PROPAGANDA

(A personal report: "The Teachers and the Taught in the U.S.S.R.," by William Benton, former Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Senator from Connecticut; presently U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO and U.S. member of its executive board; publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica.)

Communist dogma still affects creativity in the U.S.S.R.—and profoundly. Indeed, it continues to dominate the arts.

But there now appears to be a striving among Soviet artists to escape from the straitjacket orthodox Kremlin line. Although Soviet artists continue to profess devotion to "socialist realism," some examples of today's Soviet art demonstrate that "socialist realism" has softened a bit since Stalin's death. It's a little less socialist, shall we say, a little less real. Artists seem to be struggling to shake off the shackles.

The works of many Western artists—notably the abstractionists—were considered "the decadent art of the West" by Chairman Nikita Khrushchev. Some years ago Sergei

Gerasimov, then president of the Soviet Academy of Arts, said, "We respect Picasso as a fighter for peace, but he's no artist." Khrushchev termed abstract painting "pictures where one cannot tell whether they have been painted by a man's hand or daubed by the tail of a donkey."

By contrast, what is "socialist realism?" In 1932 the Central Committee of the Communist Party established "socialist realism" as the basis for all Soviet art and literature. Soviet art had to be simple and obvious enough to be understood by all the people. Its avowed mission was to serve as a propaganda instrument to advance communism. Artists were required to depict "the heroic struggle of the world proletariat * * * the grandeur of the victory of socialism, and * * * the great wisdom and heroism of the Communist Party." In essence, Soviet realism in art is a romanticized interpretation of reality in terms of the Communist Party line. Its closest approach among famous commercial artists of the United States might be the work of Norman Rockwell. An approximation among famous American paintings would be "Washington Crossing the Delaware."

When I visited Kiev in the mid-1950's, Nicolai Skachko, then deputy minister of culture for the Ukraine, sought to explain to me the iron dogma of "socialist realism" in the field of art. "Socialist realism," he said, must have "tone" as well as realism. If applied to the recommended themes, he explained that it would bring recognition and success to the Soviet artist. Some failed to apply it—and they were punished for their lack of perceptivity. Those who successfully portrayed the heroic qualities of the mother of eight hard at work in the fields of the kolkhoz—these were the artists who received the rewards.

In 1948, when Stalin cracked down on Soviet artists and writers who violated his standards of "socialist realism," many vanished suddenly. Some were never heard of again.

Two years ago, when Khrushchev cracked down on artists, sculptors, and writers, none of them vanished. Some quit writing and painting, but all remained safely in their studios. This dramatizes the change.

While I was in Moscow in May 1964, the high Communist Party official who, I was told, "makes ideology," had a meeting with top level intellectuals. The Times (London) reported that he told them they were to be given greater freedom and more opportunity for self-expression "in an environment of greater relaxation." Konstantin Simonov, former head of the Soviet Union of Journalists, told me: "I was not at the meeting. But I had a report it was a good meeting. Those who attended left with a good frame of mind." This is a new kind of language, strictly post-Stalin.

Orest G. Vereisky, corresponding member of the Academy of Arts and a popular and highly esteemed Soviet artist—as was his father before him—gave me a newly phrased defense of "socialist realism." The old definition, he felt, was too strict and too limiting.

During my visit at Vereisky's dacha in the Moscow countryside, he set forth what he suggested was the present credo:

"We are seeking new forms between the state and the artist. Our artists must now try to be individuals. But if an artist tries to become an extreme individualist—if he ceases to care about his viewers—this is indeed a very dangerous step. All Soviet artists feel that our art must be humane. It must be for the people.

"Every Soviet artist must have his own medium—for instance, he may be a landscape artist. But he must recognize his position in society. This doesn't mean that he must downgrade his work to anybody's level. If he wants to try to elevate the

What Has War Come To Mean to the Vietnamese Peasant?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, an interesting commentary depicting the life of the Vietnamese peasant in his war-torn country appeared in the Sacramento, Calif., Bee on May 16, 1965.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT HAS WAR COME TO MEAN TO THE
VIETNAMESE PEASANT?

Throughout history, war always has commanded the headlines. So it is not surprising that all of the attention in the Vietnam crisis has been directed to the running story of Vietcong raids out of the north, retaliatory air strikes, napalm bombing, and hand-to-hand guerrilla warfare in the jungles.

There is another dimension to the Vietnam story which deserves telling, however: The human story of the average Vietnamese, his fortunes, his misfortunes. The narrative has a very real part in the total plot.

For example: If a Vietnamese lives past 40, he has exceeded his life expectancy. Chronic illness is a way of life. Vietnam is rife with malaria, hepatitis, amoebic dysentery, leprosy, intestinal parasitic disorders. Epidemics of cholera and plagues are not exceptions; they are the expected.

Medically, there is little to offer. There is only 1 doctor for every 58,000 persons in Vietnam; live pigs serve as hospital disposal units. Hunger, privation abound. Life in Vietnam is bleak.

Consider also that war has been a part of the Vietnamese existence for a generation. The Vietnamese, in a way of speaking, has lived at bayonet point for so long it has become a way of life. He has seen one side or the other gain an inch or two of high ground,

people's tastes—if he thinks he has something to say—he is entitled to try. If an artist wants to preserve communication with his audience, he must expect that his audience will want to understand him."

I commented: "Here in this room—on the wall right above your table—you have a reproduction of a Braque. Don't you regard Braque as an extreme individualist? Was he trying to recognize his position in society? Was he concerned with the art of the people? You have a Van Gogh on your other wall. Was Van Gogh trying to be humane in his approach to the people? Weren't these two artists striving for individual creativity? Who could tell Braque and Van Gogh how to paint, how to elevate the people's tastes, how to be humane?"

I mentioned a small account in a newspaper about Gauguin—a little squib of Gauguin's writing had sold for \$1,500, yet he died in poverty. Vereisky interrupted sharply: "I don't have a high opinion of Gauguin."

He then insisted that there exist now in the Soviet Union "great diversity and freedom." I told him I could not see any great diversity in the output of artists, but merely a glimmering of it. He talked at length about art as it is conceived in the Soviet Union in contrast to the "commercial art" of the United States and Western Europe.

Apparently he had had many arguments on this subject with artists he met in the United States. He explained that there isn't much "commercial art" in the U.S.S.R. used in publicity or advertising. Illustration of books—and apparently he has illustrated many—is definitely regarded as a high form of art in the Soviet Union.

Vereisky was preparing for a Moscow exhibition of his recent work. This was to be strikingly different from the general exhibits as usually arranged by the Soviet Artists Union; in these, artists selected by the union exhibit one picture each. Vereisky was to have what in the United States is called a one-man show, featuring the pictures he drew in the United States. He showed me some of his drawings and watercolors of scenes in New York, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Philadelphia. He had drawn these when he accompanied the recent Soviet show of the graphic arts, the opening of which I had attended in New York, and which toured these cities. I found the pictures most pleasing. Judged by their craftsmanship, they are of high quality.

He had one especially lovely watercolor from the steps of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, with automobiles moving on the street and the skyline looming up behind in gray. There was another depicting a big sign advertising Seagram's whisky, with close-ups of little shops and restaurants, the skyline again looming in the background.

Vereisky explained that in other cities there isn't any background except the sky, but in New York there is the skyline.

Some of his American drawings and watercolors were amusing and witty. He had one of a woman walking with a little poodle titled, "Between Church and Cocktails." Only one of his drawings depicted poverty and deprivation, and he apologized for it. (He said he was not interested in doing "social drawings.") This was a drawing of a down-and-out slouching in front of a doorway.

He had these drawings ranged around his upper-floor studio. There was one very striking watercolor of an American woman walking down the street with her handkerchief to her face; she was in tears and there was an American flag behind her. Vereisky said he had drawn this on the day President Kennedy was assassinated. There was an-

other of a Negro woman sitting on a bench stitching on an American flag. He said that he had actually seen her, and I doubt that he could have imagined it. (Later, after his show, he sent me these two drawings as gifts for Mrs. Kennedy and Mrs. Johnson.)

There seems little question that art in the Soviet Union is moving toward a more liberal concept since Stalin's death, although there has been nothing like an art renaissance. Even if latitude grows, it will take some years for most artists to realize it. There was a time when virtually nothing could be painted (or printed) if it was not in some way a litany of praise to Stalin or to the Communist Party. Now it appears that it is no longer compulsory for an artist to love either one, or to express adulation in his work. It is now possible for an artist to depict Soviet life, for example, in a form somewhat short of the ideal. This is hardly true artistic expression, but it may be a start.

Of course, the leaders of the party have not given up the notion that they know what is best. If they ever give up in the field of the arts, it is possible that the Soviets, with countless years of artistic frustration damned up behind them, might produce a flood of creative art and literature that would startle the world. The native literacy and artistic talents of the Russians are indisputable. Under the Communist system, many of the most talented and gifted young people are receiving rigorous and expert training in art techniques. They are supported by the state and given fine studios in which to work. This will not make them artists, but for many it is better than the Paris folklore of the poor artist working in a garret while suffering from malnutrition. A number of them achieve high technical proficiency, and if the shakles ever are withdrawn, some of them are sure to bloom with more than a touch of genius.

It is almost impossible to imagine a President of the United States lecturing artists on their role, but Chairman Khrushchev did just that in his famous speech in 1963, "The Great Strength in Literature and Art Lies in High Ideological and Artistic Standards":

"Our people need a militant revolutionary art. And it is the mission of Soviet literature and art to recreate, in vivid artistic imagery, this great and heroic age of the building of communism, correctly to reflect the assertion and triumph to new Communist relationships * * *"

"Everything depends on how you approach realities, from what positions you appraise them. There is a saying that what you look for, you find * * *"

"Unfortunately, it sometimes happens that art workers judge reality only from the smell of outhouses, depict people in a deliberately ugly way, use the darkest colors. This can only foster dejection, gloom, and frustration. These artists depict reality in accordance with their own biased, perverted, and subjective conceptions, in accordance with artificial and anemic stereotypes of their own invention * * *. You have also seen some other products of abstract art. We condemn, and shall continue to condemn, such deformities openly and uncompromisingly."

Chairman Khrushchev stated the official view of what Soviet realism in art is not. I suspect his view will prevail in the new regime and in the one after that. Yet the struggle is on. There will be ups and downs. But there are encouraging signs that Soviet writers and intellectuals are beginning to break out of their confinement, that they are determined to fight their way toward freedom—complete freedom. No change in the U.S.S.R. could be more profound—or more hopeful—for the future.

Worker's Rights Seen Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 19 last there appeared in the Evening Star an article by the forthright and able journalist, David Lawrence, on the President's message to the Congress asking for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

While we are, of course, all aware of the President's campaign promises and of the support given him in the recent presidential election by the union leaders, we were constrained to hope that the President would not go so far as to recommend the repeal of this basic guarantee of the American laboring man's rights. We dared to hope that this would not happen because the President has gone to extremes in his stated desire to protect the rights of other groups, particularly the Negro race.

We can think of no more basic right, that we thought was guaranteed to our American citizens, than the right to work. But now the ever-increasing power of the Federal Government over the rights and liberties of the people is threatening to take away the right of the American citizen to earn a livelihood for himself and his family without first joining a union.

As one who believes in the principle of unionism and the right of collective bargaining I find it most difficult to go along with such an invasion of the rights of our American workers. If I were a laboring man I am sure I would join a union. But as a free American I would resist the effort of the Federal Government to tell me I had to belong to a union; just as I would oppose the Federal Government telling me I had to join a merchant's organization, a social club, or even my church.

Is there no end to the ever-increasing encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the States and the liberties of the people?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence's article is as follows:

WORKER'S RIGHTS SEEN THREATENED

(By David Lawrence)

President Johnson has just asked Congress to pass a law that would, in effect, take away the civil rights of the American workingman by coercing him into joining a labor union. If he refuses, he will be punished either by losing his job or by being denied a job in the future in any plant or factory or business establishment where such a union contract with the employer exists.

This proposal, if enacted into law, would wipe out overnight the laws passed by 19 States forbidding compulsory unionization and upholding the right of the individual to work anywhere without being required to give up his conscientious beliefs.

The Supreme Court of the United States has again and again affirmed the right of a citizen to freedom of belief. There are many